National Library of Canada
Canadian Theses Service
Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Service des thèses canadiennes

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

NL-339 (r. 88/04) c

Canada

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

?

PARALLELISM IN PARADISE LOST

by

SHANNON MURRAY

©

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF
GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

SPRING, 1989

National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Service
Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-52953-9

Canada

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: SHANNON KATHLEEN MARY MURRAY

TITLE OF THESIS: PARALLELISM IN PARADISE LOST

DEGREE: DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1989

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly, or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

Shannon Murray
(Student's signature)

31 Bennett St.

Red Deer, Alberta

Date: April 17, 1989

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled PARALLELISM IN PARADISE LOST, submitted by Shannon Kathleen Mary Murray in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

....Jas. F. Forrest..........
(Supervisor)

Paul G. Stanwood..........

....

....

..Patricia...Demers

Date ....February 3, 1989.......

For my parents
and for Gerald

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines parallelism in John Milton's Paradise Lost, particularly in the repetition of key words and phrases, in the presentation of similarly described -- if sometimes morally opposite -- characters, and in the poem's balanced design. After an introductory chapter, which considers the nature of parallelism and the critical discussion of issues pertaining to paralleling in Milton's epic, the second chapter examines the extent to which paralleling appears in earlier epics, especially in The Aeneid and The Faerie Queene. Chapter III considers the ability of recurring words and phrases such as "hand," "fruit," and "all our woe" to superimpose on specific important moments in the text the cumulative effects of all other occurrences. Chapter IV examines the relationship between biblical typology and prelapsarian hierarchy, arguing that the typological method of understanding mankind's place in relation to Christ -- a method introduced in Books XI and XII by the archangel Michael -- is the "fallen" equivalent of the poem's earlier method, one that depends on a series of paralleled if lesser images of God. Chapter IV then continues the examination of paralleled characters and events, concentrating on those characters, primarily Satan and his followers, who establish themselves, not as lesser images of God, but as parodies. The last chapter deals with the poem's paralleled structure.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter **Page**

I. Introduction 1

II Parallelism and the Epic Tradition 31

III Paralleled Words and Phrases 57

IV The Paralleling of Characters and Events: Biblical Typology and Hierarchical Images 96

V The Paralleling of Characters and Events: Satanic Parody 139

VI Conclusion: Structural Parallels 175

Works Cited 193

Chapter I

Introduction

> Literature, let me suggest, from the simplest folk tale to the most sophisticated poetry and fiction and drama, thrives on parallelism, both stylistic and structural, and could not give its creations satisfying shape without it.
>
> Robert Alter, The Art of Biblical Poetry

A "parallel" in a work of literature may most simply be defined as a close agreement in details, tendency, motive, or sound between two or more components.[1] Such components may be characters, chapters, stanzas, events, individual verses, actions, and so on; they may be as small as a rhyme, which connects two words through the consonance of their terminal sounds, or as large as paralleled halves of an epic, in which many factors, such as the placement of events, the similarity of characters in each half, and the repetition of key phrases, contribute to the gradual cumulative effect of likeness. So generally defined here and in Alter's words, parallelism in literature becomes almost omnipresent, and as such the term would be of limited value to the literary critic who would be reduced to discovering every where what everywhere exists.[2] Its utility is in the difference between kinds of parallelism, two of which -- the stylistic and the structural -- Alter mentions. All kinds of parallels do not exist in all works; Tom Jones, for example, possesses a carefully paralleled structure, yet it lacks the repeated paralleling of individual phrases which make up the texture of Biblical poetry.[3] Yet more useful is the endeavour to judge a parallel's significance in apprehending a work's meaning; the question, then, should be not to what extent a work depends on parallelism, but to what use it is put.

Critics have long recognized the more obvious examples of contrasts and comparisons in Paradise Lost. The Son's offered sacrifice in Book III follows too soon after Satan's similarly described offer in Book II for the likeness to be missed. The fall of the angels and the fall of mankind are so similar that the first is recounted by Raphael as a warning against the second. And the power of God in the creation of the world recalls the power of the Devils in creating Pandaemonium and of the poet to recount the story. Although such parallels as these are almost commonplaces in Milton criticism, they are most often mentioned in passing or used to illustrate other arguments; few attempts have been made to pursue less obvious parallels, and no study looks at the cumulative effect of all the parallels.[5]

This thesis intends to fill that void. The basic questions from which the study begins are these: Where are the parallels in Paradise Lost? Why are there so many? What are the boundaries between kinds of parallels? What are the relationships between the kinds? What effect do they have? Are there dangers as well as profits in some connections, such as those between moral opposites? Are Milton's parallels particular to his mind and his subject, or does he follow a narrative precedent? And most importantly, How do the parallels invite one to read Paradise Lost?

To begin with, I shall suggest two effects of parallelism in general. The simplest is the imposition of unity on a work: the presence of a great number of parallels orders the work and demonstrates control by the poet. For example, there are numerous similarities that link

Books I and II to Books XI and XII. Both relate the history of a fallen species, both show those species attempting to build in the land to which they have been exiled, and both show the possibility -- false in the devils' case and real in mankind's -- of escape from sorrow through the great sacrifice of a chosen one. Such parallels connect the last books to what has gone before and show the poem ending as it had begun.

A yet more valuable result of parallelism -- especially in light of the many questions raised about the poem in this century -- occurs when one element is superimposed upon another. Each element in the parallelism must alter the meaning of the other, whether by contrast or by comparison, even if the parallel is between two identical passages. An example of such identity exists in Books X and XI, in which first Adam suggests the form of repentance and then sees it carried out: the words Adam and the narrator use in these two circumstances are identical, but even here there is some alteration because of the contexts. What is important in a parallel within a work is that the two things will be conjoined in the reader's mind, and the perception of both will be reshaped.

A few examples are in order here. When the Son in Book III offers to take on the task proposed by the Father for the redemption of mankind, the offering, the council itself, and other lesser details -- such as the muteness of the rest of the gathering -- recall most clearly Satan's offer to take up the devils' quest in Book II. The Son does not, then, offer in a vacuum, for his action is seen in the context of the previous action. The effect may be ironic: Satan goes to pervert, while the Son goes to redeem. The parallel, however, also provides some of the information necessary to judge the Son's actions properly. Because of the structured nature of the Heavenly council, in which God asks hoping to be answered by the Son, the offer may on its own seem a pointless and contrived ritual. But compared with Satan's version of the scene, in which the outcome has, the narrator tells us, truly been arranged, the Son's response appears far more freely given.

A similar imposition of perceptions from elsewhere occurs in the smaller parallels, the repetition of phrases or single words. When the Son, pleased, shows the Father "what first fruits on Earth are sprung / From thy implanted Grace in Man" (XI.22-3), he refers to the prayers of repentance to which Adam and Eve have turned, but his use of the word "fruits" should recall most clearly the object of prohibition, whose "mortal taste" created the need for repentance. "Fruit" of course appears not just once, but many times after its introduction in the poem's first line, and as the object of mankind's temptation it is central to the fall itself. Thus the Son's choice of "fruits" to mean the "results of repentance" connects the nature of the crime and the consequences of the fall.

It is not only the second element in a parallel that will be affected, however. In the parallel between Satan's offering and the Son's, for instance, what may have seemed a noble sacrifice in Book II pales when compared to the Son's sacrifice in Book III. A parallel, then, is not used only to show similarity; indeed, its ability to show true difference within apparent similarity is more valuable. The central acts of choice in the poem involve distinguishing between evil that resembles good and real good. Each parallel will not have the same effect. There may be parallels in which the second element suffers by the connection and ones in which the second shows itself the superior, but the relationship leaves neither unaltered. As the second is shaped by the first, so the first must be reshaped in retrospection and in rereading by the second. As Isabel MacCaffery suggests, Paradise Lost is a poem intended to be reread (81).

The word "parallel" may be confusing because it is so often used to refer to allusion, to the poet's use of previous works to inform his own. Much recent criticism and scholarship has shown Milton's reliance on allusion to be a feature of the structure and meaning of Paradise Lost.[6] Allusion resembles the internal parallels in that it brings to bear on one point in a poem meaning from beyond that point, but it differs in two important ways. First, a connection between characters who are to be found active in the same text must differ from one between characters from different texts. Eve in her role as tempter of Adam is paralleled to the greater tempter, Satan, and so Satan's character and his previous actions will inform a reading of Eve's. Similarly, the comparison of Eve with Pandora in Book IV superimposes on the description of Eve the character of Pandora, who is known not only for her great beauty but also for introducing evil into a peaceful world. But while what is known of Pandora will add to what is thought of Eve, Pandora can be but little altered by the comparison. While Eve's character is in question in the poem, Pandora's is not. Satan's character is an issue in the poem, however, and both in restrospection and in his continued presence he will carry with him the connection with Eve. Internal parallelism, then, puts both elements in a connection into play, allusion only one. The distinction between the two is one of degree; one may feel compelled to view Rosencrantz and Guildenstern in Hamlet differently after seeing Stoppard's play, for example, or to sympathize more with Bertha Rochester after reading Jean Rhys' Wide Sargasso Sea, but these are more extreme examples than those in which a character from another work appears in a less important role. In general, the already-created character remains more static than the one in the process of revealing itself.

Another difference between internal parallelism and allusion can be seen in their less immediate effects. Allusion establishes the poem within its context, making it a part of what has gone before, whether it conforms to that tradition or alters it; parallelism establishes the relationship of a poem's parts to its whole. The liberal use of both allusion and internal parallelism in Paradise Lost shows Milton's awareness of the two characteristics essential to the epic: the unity demanded by Aristotle and the sense of the epic tradition evident in the epic since Virgil.

A similar difference exists between internal parallelism and allegory. There again it is the imposition of other perceptions on a single perception. In allegory, as in allusion, these other perceptions come from elsewhere than the confines of the immediate narrative. For example, the allegorical character "Sin" in Paradise Lost exhibits characteristics which are meant to associate her with the abstract notion "sin." The allegorical character of Sin may be paralleled to other characters in the poem, however, as she is with Eve: both are born from the body of a male, both exhibit "attractive graces," and both can be said to have brought death into the world and all our woe. These connections are rooted in the text, however, not in an external realm of connections.

The term "parallelism" is unfortunately if necessarily an inclusive one. It refers here to a variety of correspondences which alone invite the use of separate terms. The frequent appearance of words such as "fruit," "woe," or "hand," for example, might best be called "repetition." "Comparison and contrast" would serve in the discussion of similarly described characters and events, while "symmetry" makes clearer the structure that the paralleling of whole books produces. All these terms will be useful when the various levels of likeness are discussed, but one term is needed to refer to them all.[7] The point is not only to show the various levels, but also to show that they are related: one level of likeness reinforces the next. Parallelism here, then, refers only to internal connections and comprehends a number of levels of similarity:

the repetition of words and phrases, similarities between characters, events that recall other events and books that recall other books. This discussion of Paradise Lost will divide them into three sections, although that division belies a characteristic of the paralleling: the parallels depend one on the other, and their general effect results from that dependence. It is for the sake of the discussion that the division will be made.

There has been some comment on the paralleling in Paradise Lost, but the bulk of it is concerned with the poem's structure: the arrangement of books. Other parallels, such as those between characters and the repetition of key words which do not fit neatly into the balancing of books, have been less frequently examined. The most notable studies that do deal with parallelism that is other than structural include Joseph Summers' The Muse's Method, Isabel MacCaffrey's Paradise Lost as Myth, and Kathleen Swaim's article "'Hee for God only, shee for God in him': Structural Parallelism in Paradise Lost." The imbalance is interesting, given that the controversy that occupied critics of the poem for much of this century focussed far more on characterization -- the degradation or degeneration of Satan, for example, or the motives of Adam in his fall -- and the epic's style than on the features of structure. Yet there is much to be gained from a consideration of parallels in either case. A proper judgement of character is impossible without attention to his status in parallels with other characters, and an examination of the uses to which Milton put simply repeated words and phrases will clarify some questions about the purpose and effectiveness of the Grand Style.

Mabel MacCaffrey argues that because Milton was writing with myth as his subject, he adopted techniques appropriate to the natural movement of myth, among them "a style reverbatory and unmetaphorical, and a spatial structural pattern of interlocking, mutually dependent parts" (42). In her third chapter she discusses some of these interlocking parts, for which her phrase is "retrospection and anticipation." This phrase insists upon the function of the parallels within time, and it is this function that MacCaffrey wishes to stress as the key to both epic and mythological patterns (45). She identifies a number of the parallels, arguing that the repetition creates the poem's spatial quality by "freeing" it "from the limits of chronology" (82). Milton could then "concentrate on emotional relationships and bring together incidents or images to shed light on each other" (82). But it is in the "reverberations" of individual words that she is most interested. She mentions the uses of "woe," "fruit," "chaos," "tree," and "sea," many of which she finds in the "phrasal groundwork" of the poem's first thirty-five lines (83). The largest patterns she notes are directional; Raphael and Satan both move from Heaven's gate to Earth, for example. The whole poem, she says, follows the mythic pattern of a great rise and fall within which are smaller such movements (59-62). Along with these movements of characters in the narrative comes the narrator's use of words suggesting height, such as "lofty style," "sacred top," "fall off," "favoured . . . so highly," or "deep tract." Her work is useful for its attempt to connect patterns at a number of levels, including words and phrases, paralleled events, and the structure of the whole poem. However, she uses all her data for the one purpose of showing the "mythic" quality of the poem, and hence the parallels take on one uniform meaning: they enable the reader to keep in mind the whole scope of the poem by references backwards and forwards, and thus make time appear spatial. What she does not consider is the basis for a judgement of actions and motives that such parallels, even in the repetition of key words, provide where they occur.

Milton's repetition of key words which appear at crucial moments in the poem, bringing with them accumulated meaning from elsewhere, has received attention from other critics. Christopher Ricks, defending Milton from the charges that he had "renounced the English language" (Leavis 52), discusses the "delicate anticipations and echoes" which the repeated use of words such as "error" and "luxury" in different contexts lends the poem (110-112). Kester Svendsen in Milton and Science, has examined the use of the word "hand" at various significant points in the relationship between Adam and Eve. Galbraith Crump discusses one repeated image in The Mystical Design of Paradise Lost, discovering some interesting parallels along the way:

> Adopting the traditional symbol of God as a point or circle, the centre and circumference of all things, Milton fashioned his poem to embody that symbol in its smallest syntactical detail as in its largest structural design. (18)

Much of his argument deals with the poem's structure, which he calls one great "antimetabole" with its centre at the defeat of Satan in Book VI, but this structure depends on the smaller repetition of one geometrical pattern. For Crump, then, the most important pattern in the poem is that of the circle.

Jackson Cope carries on the work of Ricks and MacCaffrey in The Metaphoric Structure of Paradise Lost, mentioning throughout the importance of key words repeated at key moments. The thesis of the book is that "Paradise Lost can best be understood as a poem in which certain repeated metaphors mimetically express the epic theme" (6), and he examines the repeated appearances of such metaphors as rising and falling, blindness and sight, light and darkness. He is particularly interested in the connections bet ween the repeated words and larger events: the patterns of darkness and falling, for instance, are associated with the movements of Satan (118). Cope's interest in metaphor, though, necessarily limits the kinds of patterns he notices; "light" and "dark" are interesting because they signify the spiritual status of the characters. The same is true of the words of rising and falling, especially in a poem whose central action -- the fall of mankind -- invites the metaphor. Unmetaphorical patterns are untouched.

Although the debate about Milton's "Grand Style," carried on principally by F.R. Leavis, T.S. Eliot, C.S. Lewis, and Christopher Ricks, does not involve an examination of repeated word patterns directly, the questions raised about the quality of Milton's verse do bear on an examination of paralleling in the poem, for they dispute the value of "ritual" in poetry generally. To say that the repetition of simple words and phrases -- used for their ability to raise to the reader's consciousness other associations within the poem -- is a major part of Milton's verse style as much as agrees with those who in the earlier half of this century criticized Milton's verse for its "ritualism." Indeed, Milton used such qualities to advantage, suiting them both to his epic genre and to his biblical subject.

Although there were earlier objections to Milton's style, Dryden's perhaps most notable, the most serious and influential arguments come not in Milton's own century but in ours. The objections are twofold: against Milton's verse and against the "grand style" generally. Some of the objections are levelled at Milton's "Latinizing," his tendency to prefer a foreign to a native word or construction. The charge finds in Milton's poetry a contempt for his own tongue, a "callousness to the intrinsic nature of English" in Leavis' words. According to Pound, Milton's syntax betrays an attempt to "use an uninflected language as if it were an inflected one" (238). Such specific charges of "Latinizing" have been answered by a number of critics, including Lewis, who believes such alterations are necessary to improve the less versatile English tongue, and Alastair Fowler, who argues that some of the so-called Latin words and phrases are actually English.[8]

But the charge of contempt for the English language is only a small part of the larger problem that Leavis, Eliot, and others address in Milton's verse. In the terms of these critics, Milton's verse does not do what good English poetry, the standard for which is the verse of Shakespeare and to some degree Donne, should do. Leavis, in his discussion of Milton in Revaluation, describes the best of poetic language as that which depends upon "the natural sense movement against the verse structure, and ... 'natural' here involves a reference, more or less direct, to idiomatic speech" (50-1). Eliot's words are similar: Milton did not continue the "tradition of conversational language in poetry." Eliot was particularly distressed by the separation of "sound" from "sense" in Milton's poetry, which he describes as its "musical quality." Leavis offers a similar comment when he discusses a difference between the elevation of the language and the thing being described:

> To say that Milton's verse is magniloquent is to say that it is not doing as much as its impressive pomp and volume seem to be asserting; that mere orotundity is a disproportionate part of the whole effect; that it demands more deference than it merits (45).

The problem, then, is twofold. One must determine whether indeed Milton's verse exhibits a rupture between sense and sound, and then, if the point is conceded, whether there is reason for the rupture. Critics such as Eliot and Leavis show a definite preference for what is natural or conversational in verse, and "ritual" is therefore to be avoided. It is, then, the "Grand Style" itself that is most to blame, and the epic by association, since that genre requires such an elevated style.[9] It may be, as Pope suggests and as Rajan reiterates, that the poem contains many styles, so that any number of samplings will produce different conclusions. While attention to the patterns of single words and phrases, then, may not produce a uniform statement about the character of all of Milton's verse, it should provide a partial answer to Leavis' objections, both because it will show the frequent simplicity of the "Grand Style" and because it will demonstrate the subtle effects that a kind of ritual in verse may cause.

Examinations of the effects the paralleling of characters has on Paradise Lost are few, but among them are some fine individual studies. Kathleen Swaim, for example, takes up MacCaffrey's interest in the paralleling of characters in the poem, though her study is less inclusive in its data and limits itself to the relationship between Adam and Eve. She calls parallelism Milton's "major means of tightening the poetry and structure of Paradise Lost" (121) and notes a few of the most frequently mentioned of the parallels: the fall of man and angels, the two first-hand accounts of human creation, the temptations by toad and serpent, and the councils and trinities in Heaven and Hell (122). But, she writes, unnoticed is an important parallel between the relationship of Adam to Eve and that of God to Adam. She uses three groups of paralleled instances in the poem as evidence: Eve's love song in Book IV and Adam's account to Raphael in Book VIII; Adam and Eve's parting and their fallen evaluations of it; and their reconciliation and reunion through prayer. Her thesis is that Eve's relationship to Adam provides "explicit experiential guidelines for more fully comprehending the abstract analogues of Adam's intercourse with a divinity that must remain essentially mysterious." The hierarchy of the characters is made clear through "images": Christ and Adam are the images of God, Eve the image of Adam. The hierarchy of patterns leads one up to the unknowable, and so when Adam forgives Eve he provides for himself the ability to understand and accept reconciliation with the Father. So Milton does for us what Raphael does for Adam -- "likening spiritual matters to the corporeal forms that best express them in order to relate to human sense invisible exploits and explanations that otherwise surmount the reach of our minds" (147).

Swaim's discussion of this aspect of the parallel between the two humans and God and man is useful, but it ignores part of the effect of the parallel. Swaim's interest in it is as a means of understanding things "invisible to the eye"; but the relationship between Adam and Eve, while it may be similar to that of God to man, is not identical. God behaves as befits his position, but Adam often does not. The parallel, then, shows not only the similarity between the two elements, but also by the implied comparison, Adam's failure.

Swaim acknowledges a debt to Joseph Summers' book The Muse's Method, and it is in that book that some of the first serious attention is paid to the importance of paralleling in the poem. He is especially good in the discussion of the diabolic trinity of Satan, Sin, and Death in the oft-criticized allegory in Book II and its relation to the Holy Trinity. He notices not only this parallel, however, but also that between Satan and Sin and Adam and Eve; much of the poem, he argues, presents the education of our first parents on the nature of sin and death, and in this educative process the two humans "unconsciously reflect the actions and language of those monsters" (59). The discussion that follows merely introduces the subject, however. Less is said, for instance, of the relationship between Eve and Sin than may be said, but the chapter ends with a good conclusion about the purpose of such parallels:

> The episodes of Sin and Death are not lapses or "excursions"; they are integral to Paradise Lost. They provide an essential perspective on the character of Satan, on the nature of Hell, and on the nature of reality. They help define for us the persistent symbolic structure of the poem whereby all the major actions and emotions of human life are reflected, imitated, or parodied as they occur in Hell or Heaven or on Earth. (70)

Summers' conclusion is much like Swaim's: parallels provide a basis for understanding.

Some criticism, then, has identified various of the parallels in Paradise Lost, showing both that they exist and that they are important. The recalling and anticipating of events in the poem work to establish the poem's shape and are also appropriate to the secondary epic, but these are not the only functions. It is not even sufficient to suggest, as does Kathleen Swaim, that the parallels show one character to be like the other; while she sees the equivalences between Adam and God as a means by which to understand God--the unknowable--such equivalences also reflect on Adam. Thus in such a parallel the presence of a perfect element in the equivalence will point out the degree of the faults of the other and the nature of them. What I am suggesting, then, is not the replacement of these ideas but an addition: while the parallels structure the text, tighten the poetry (Swaim 121), establish the spatial quality of the poem, and provide a means of understanding the unknowable, they also provide a basis for judgement of the characters, a necessary basis considering the variety of interpretations given the main characters.

The need for such judgement is particularly clear in those studies where one character is examined in isolation; the result is often error. For example, A.J.A. Waldock concludes that Adam's fall proceeds from the greatest of human emotions: love. We cannot therefore wish Adam to have done other than he did, and, he suggests, all critics -- whether they admit it or not -- recognize the beauty of the act. He reaches his conclusions by examining Adam's seventeen lines at Eve's fall (IX. 908-16, 952- 9), and dismisses the narrator's contention that Adam was "fondly overcome" as another case of Milton's material getting away from him. Whether Adam's words just before his fall are more trustworthy than the narrator's is only one of the questions here. We do not only have the narrator's word for it; the reader may judge Adam's action in the context of the other similar sacrifices: Satan's and the Son's. There is a signal of parallelism in Adam's words: "Death is to me as life." This statement appears on its own to be a stalwart and courageous one, but it must recall Satan's earlier "Evil be thou my good." In both cases the logic is faulty: the world of the poem is one in which opposites are not equal, and Satan's claim, based on the same logic, that he can make a Heaven of Hell is false. And the position of both claims, Satan's coming as he hardens himself to his task of seduction and Adam's as he hardens himself to the task of allowing the other half of humanity to fall, makes Adam's ominous. As well, the sacrifice Adam is about to offer, when compared to the Son's and even to Eve's in Book X, pales, and far more clearly resembles the offering of Satan. The actions, then, take their places in a hierarchy of nobility, with the Son's assuming the highest place, followed by Eve's, Adam's, and finally Satan's. By itself, each action loses its reverberative quality and the reader loses the necessary context within which to judge those actions.

While studies examining the paralleling of characters or phrases are rare, critics have paid more attention to the order some of the parallels create. Indeed, most of the work on Paradise Lost's structure has relied on paralleled incidents to show the poem's balanced design. This balance has not always been appreciated, however; criticism of the structure of Paradise Lost dates back to Addison, who determined that, while Book X was like the last act of a tragedy, Books XI and XII were superfluous, or at least "not generally reckoned among the most shining books of the poem" (216). His objection was seconded by C.S. Lewis who calls those last books an "untransmuted lump of futurity" and evidence of a "grave structural flaw" (129). Some of the discussion of structure which follows comes as a response to these objections.

by showing those last two books to be necessary, if not to the narrative, then to the completion of the poem's larger design, a design in which the last two books complement ones which have gone before.

That larger design has been described in a number of ways: numerologically, dramatically, and spatially. A common problem that most critics address is Milton's expansion of the ten-book epic to twelve books in 1674. Indeed, the second edition represents less a revision than a redivision. Not much new material is introduced -- a total of 15 lines are added, mainly as bridges between existing passages -- nor is material rearranged. The two greatest changes are the halving of two already existing books: Book VII becomes Books VII and VIII and Book X becomes Books XI and XII. The problem is this: if it is important that the books in Paradise Lost be arranged to reveal a certain pattern, as critics have suggested, why would that pattern not have been obvious to Milton before the first edition was printed? Milton's intention must be inferred, or the efforts of critics to show how carefully the poem's structure is ordered seem in vain.

The problem has been addressed in a number of ways. John Shawcross in "The Balanced Structure of Paradise Lost" prefers the ten-book structure, arguing that the symmetry for which the twelve-book structure is lauded is not the only way to achieve balance in a poem, nor is it necessarily the best way. His argument depends upon the numerological balances in the poem, which the reordering and adding of lines destroy. The original poem, for instance, contains 10,550 lines, a number appropriate to many permutations of the Pythagorean perfect number 10; the revision expands the number to 10,565, a numerologically unprofitable sum. What Shawcross assumes, as Galbraith Crump points out, is that the revision represents a falling away from Milton's aesthetic ideal, when it is surely evidence of his attempt to approximate more closely that ideal.

James Whaler's explanation, in *Counterpoint and Symbol*, is more idiosyncratic. He disagrees with Shawcross, stating not only that the second version is Milton's preferred one, but also that Milton intended his epic to be in twelve books all along; the first edition was to have been issued while Milton knew full well that he would revise and bring to his work the right proportioning which the first edition lacked. In that first edition he was to have paid temporary homage to a "rival, though subsurface, concept of proportioning":

> *The division of Ed. I is meant to effect a descending primary Pythagorean progression by the thematic groupings of its successive books*. Its directional significance is unmistakable. It is consistent with the identical retrograde series 4, 3, 2, 1 scattered through the rhythms of PL, where it always responds to contextual situations involving disaster, defeat, moral obliquity, loss, sorrow.
>
> Numerical symbol therefore explains the *temporary* partitioning of Ed. I. . . . The division of 1667 is temporary tribute to his Muse by way of Pythagorean symbol; that of 1674 is permanent tribute to epic tradition and its most inspired exemplar. (164)

The explanation seems forced. For one thing it implies that in his first edition Milton knowingly emphasized "disaster, defeat, moral obliquity, loss, sorrow" rather than justification (Crump 78). For another it draws the rather unlikely picture of a poet presenting a disposable version of his poem to the public before revealing the "real" permanent one.

The third and, it seems to me, most sensible explanation for the revision is given by Arthur Barker. It was Barker's essay "*Structural Pattern in Paradise Lost*" in 1949 which began the interest in the poem's structure, and it is to this essay that Shawcross and the others in part respond. Barker argues that in the 1667 version Milton used the five-act epic structure described by Davenant in the "Preface" to *Gondibert*. Such a structure recalls tragedy, and in it the emphasis must fall not on God's triumph but on Satan's in Book IX, which emphasis Milton later decided was inappropriate to his subject. With the simple shift to a twelve-book epic, Milton replaced the tragic emphasis of the structure with the more positive Virgilian echo. Not only is the epic supposed to have a happy ending, as opposed to tragedy's unhappy one, but in his repatterning Milton could echo the emphases of Virgil's divisions. Barker says that in both epics, the "rests," those places where the mind senses the divisions, fall on positive moments: moments of prophesy in the Aeneid and of the revelations of God's Providence in Paradise Lost. The purpose of the revision, then, is to "reduce the structural emphasis on the Fall of man and to increase the emphasis on his restoration"(26).

The argument is convincing until the end, where Barker argues for the two versions in one:

> If the disposition of the masses was patient of a tragic pattern of structural interpretation in 1667, the unmoved masses remain patient of it after the tinkering of 1674. If they were patient of a Virgilian patterning in 1674, they were already so in 1667. No amount of arithmetical ingenuity can obscure this fact. One must read both poems and see both patterns, for the two patterns suspend the theme between the horns of a paradox. This is the chief function of its structure. (29)

Here Milton's first edition is not to be disposable, but with the first it is to form a palimpsest, where one version must be visible through the other. If Milton intended the restructuring to take the emphasis away from Satan's triumph and place it on God's, a will to preserve the Satanic version as well might indeed give Blake's comment that Milton was "of the Devil's party" credence. Surely the simplest way to think of the restructuring is this: Milton saw in the first edition a structural imbalance which, seven years later, he corrected.

Discussions of the structure sometimes deal with the first edition, usually with the second, but they agree on one point: within that structure certain books are grouped together for a significant purpose. Barker in his essay writes that the twelve-book structure invited a number of divisions which were mathematically unavailable in the ten-book. A threefold structure exists, in which one senses a division between the two groups of six books each, the three groups of four books each, and the six groups of two books each. These divisions are calculated to emphasize the positive in the poem, by ending each time on an expression of divine providence. The reader's mind is supposed to recognize not only small breaks at the end of each book, but also greater breaks at the end of each pair, each tetrad, and each of the two halves. The resulting partitioning would look something like this:

|
I II : III IV   V VI : VII VIII   IX X : XI XII
|
(My diagram)

So, for instance, as the books are divided into groups of two, it is not on Book IX that the reader's mind is allowed to pause, but rather on the more positive event of remorse in Book X. And in the 4,4,4 structure each section concludes positively, with the promise of the Son's sacrifice before the heavenly council, the account of creation, and the promise revealed by Michael of the Son's sacrifice. The division into two equal parts of six books each has the first half of the poem end with the defeat of Satan's armies in Heaven and the next half begin with the account of creation. Barker, as I have mentioned, sees the model for this kind of division in The Aeneid, where the most obvious division of the poem into two groups of six books, the first telling of Aeneas' travels and the second of his battles, is accompanied by the secondary and tertiary divisions into three groups of four and six groups of two.

It is the divisions into two and into three that Barker stresses. The first places the defeat of Satan and the creation of the world at the poem's centre. The second, he states, divides the poem according to the character of most importance: Satan in the first four books, the Son in the second, and Adam in the last. These assignments are, it seems to me, arbitrary. Attractive though it is to have the Son again in the centre position, his presence in Book VIII is surely not felt as strongly as Adam's. And Satan does not occupy the position of interest in Book III more than the Son does. Leaving Eve out of the picture is another flaw; there are surely moments in the last four books where she is central, and she shares Adam's fate. The last four books should at least be assigned to "mankind," which would also cover the account of the generations of man in Books XI and XII. The division into three sets of four books becomes far more satisfying when it is seen to fall around the embedded narratives of Raphael in Books V to VIII. The poem becomes one of preparation (I-IV), warning (V-VIII), and fall (IX-XII).

Shawcross' essay attempts to prove the first edition the structurally superior, arguing for its numerological balance.[11] He sees the poem's structure as a fabric woven, again, of three distinct patterns: a bipartite, a pyramidic, and a tetractyc. The poem's halves are paralleled in the bipartite division, with the resulting organization looking like this:

I,II -- VII
III -- VIII
IV -- IX
V,VI -- X

The pyramidic construction has the poem again divided in halves, but this time the books move toward and fall away from the centre:

I,II -- X
III -- IX
IV -- VIII
V,VI -- VII

These two patterns, he claims, do not oppose one another, "but rather [indicate] a complex overply, like the threads of a woven fabric" (705). Added to these two is a numerological ordering of the ten books. Not only do the original 10,550 lines demonstrate the perfect number ten in a number of ways, but the ten books may be arranged in the Pythagorean tetrachys:

I
II III
IV V VI
VII VIII IX X

(All three diagrams are mine.) Here his demonstration is less convincing. That Books I and II balance Book X (the bipartite grouping), and that Book I in its invocation matches Book VII (the pyramidic grouping), are demonstrated with relative ease; that Books II and III, showing the council in Heaven and the parodic council in Hell, may be seen as a unit may also be accepted; but the linking of Books IV, V, and VI is unsatisfying, and no more satisfying is the grouping of the last four books. Shawcross insists that to see the arrangement of the four groups in descending rather than his own ascending order is to missee it, but the books demand a different order. In the ten-book edition, the first four books introduce all characters, the next three present Raphael's narrative, the next two the fall and remorse, and the last Michael's account of the future; the divisions work far more neatly this way, but as Shawcross knows, if

Milton had intended this order, then justice would have been at the wrong end of the poem, and he would have undermined his own effort.

Another troubling point is the meaning attached to the four numbers 1, 2, 3, and 4 in the Pythagorean numerological system: as Isabel Rivers explains, "one" represents unity, "two" defect or excess, "three" the reconciliation of opposites, and "four" justice or equilibrium (179-80). If Milton were as serious about the Pythagorean scheme as Shawcross insists, he would have avoided an association of his first book, the book of the fallen angels, with unity. The same complaint might be lodged against the association of justice with all the last four books, effectively the poem's second half. And to suggest, as Shawcross does, that Milton's change in 1674 (which destroyed the numerological balance that Shawcross perceives) represented "hucksterism," a desire to "sell more books, reach more people," is to support one's own ingenious theory at the expense of the poet's character (711).

Shawcross is not the only critic to attempt to explain the structure of Paradise Lost with numerological data; indeed, after A. Kent Hieatt's striking discovery of the numbers in Spenser's Epithalamion, one Renaissance text after another came under scrutiny for such patterns. Alastair Fowler has argued that in Elizabethan poetry there was wide distribution of construction on numerical principles:

> Most of the good poets and many of the less good seem to have practiced the method. In fact, we should probably regard it less as an isolated device or concetto than as a general level of organization, intermediate between the prosodic and the internal structure. (Triumphal Forms 21)

Fowler is cautious about the application of such theories to Paradise Lost in the introduction to his 1968 edition of the poem, and even in Triumphal Forms he avoids reducing it to a series of ingenious mathematical formulations. In the first part of his book, Fowler recounts the triumphal tradition of placing the king, the throne, or something of particular importance at the centre of a procession or masque, and he argues that this tendency worked its way into literature; thus in Milton's poem the "general centre" falls on the appearance of Christ and the subsequent defeat of the bad angels, but the true centre, the poem's two middle lines, refers to the throne of Christ itself (117) (I add the third line to complete the sentence):

> Over thir heads a crystal Firmament,
> Whereon a Sapphire Throne, inlaid with pure
> Amber, and colors of the show'ry Arch. (VI.757-9)

Although he does not subscribe to Shawcross' tetractyc structure theory, he defends one of Shawcross' patterns of organization -- that of recessed symmetry, with the twelve books of the second edition moving toward and falling away from a central point -- and he identifies the major relationships between the books as follows:

I,II	Consequences of the angels' fall
III	Heavenly Council: Satan enters the world
IV	First temptation of man
VI	Messiah's triumph
IX	Second temptation of man
X	Heavenly council: Satan leaves the world
XI,XII	Consequences of man's fall

This arrangement seems a sensible one.

Other such studies are not so sensible. James Whaler, one of the first to seek numerological patterns in *Paradise Lost*, discusses elaborate arrangements caused by the numbers of beats intervening between breaks in the sense. The study is, as Fowler argues, based on elusive data and assigns arbitrary meanings to the numbers, ones which have little support in seventeenth-century arithmology (Fowler *Preface* 23). Maren-Sophie Rostvig's work is less eccentric; in *The Hidden Sense* she limits herself to numerological structure in *De*

Doctrina Christiana, "The Nativity Ode," and "Comus," where she argues more convincingly than Whaler for Milton's awareness and early interest in numerology. Gunnar Qvarnström has done much work on Paradise Lost's numbers; in The Enchanted Palace he identifies numerical patterns in the poem's chronology, and then moves to a discussion of the central passage of the poem, the enthronement of Christ. He contends that count ing lines in the speeches of various characters yields fruitful information. For instance Christ's two speeches at the very centre of the poem occupy twenty-three lines each; the number twenty-three sometimes signified "the fullness of Christ's redemption," sometimes "vengeance on the heathen" (Fowler Preface 23). Qvarnström was the first to note that the lines in the first edition's centre fall significantly on Christ's ascension to his chariot.

Arguing against such findings is difficult; discovering numerical patterns is easier than showing their absence. But although such studies do move towards an account of the structure of the poem, the numbers they discover are secondary to the arrangement of the poem itself, even when the numbers are clearly present. Rivers makes the distinction between "formal" and "constitutive" numerology: in the latter, the poem is about numbers; in the former the numbers are embedded in the poem's structure and the counting of stanzas, lines, or even words may be neces sary to discover them. While Milton's early interest in formal numerology cannot be denied -- Røstvig's work on Milton's early poetry seems proof -- the importance of it to an understanding of his mature work has not been demonstrated. A poet may create on mathematical principles, as God was thought to have done, and thus imitate divine creation, but if they are visible the principles may be aesthetically pleasing while not contributing to the meaning of the poem itself; and if they are invisible, they may be "meant to be legible only to God, the poet, and the initiate" (Rivers 184).

One argument that attempts to reconcile the schemes of Barker and Shawcross, but which ignores the numerological interests of the latter, is Douglas A. Northrop's in "The Double Structure of Paradise Lost." He believes that what he calls Barker's "sequential" reading, a reading which emphasizes chronology, can exist alongside Shawcross' "geometric" reading, which emphasizes the spatial features of the poem; indeed, the two must be seen together or one important aspect of the poem will be overlooked. What connects the two is the double perspective of time (corresponding to the sequential) and eternity (the geometric):

> Man, immersed in and limited to time, sees the world in sequential development; man, insofar as he gains the perspective of eternity, is able to perceive the geometric patterns of balance and opposition. (76)

Northrop goes on to discuss the notions of time and eternity in the poem, but his opening point is a good one; one "structure" in Paradise Lost determines the story's forward movement, the other its static shape. It is with both that the parallels are concerned, as they establish a static structure through their repetitions and affect the drama by altering the way characters are understood.

Among those studies which deal with lesser aspects of the structural parallels are Rosalie Colie's and J.R. Watson's. Colie is, like Northrop, concerned with time and eternity and their relationship to Christian paradoxes such as that of the felix culpa. She notes that Books I and VI contain the same event, the expulsion of the bad angels, and that it is the creation of the world and its recreation which begin and end the second half, but she also discusses the connection, not an obscure one, between the first two books and the last two; the first deal with the lives of fallen angels, the last with the lives of fallen men. The fourth book from the beginning and the fourth book from the end are also contrasted, the first presenting unfallen, idyllic Eden and the second showing the fall; the books of Eden, then, fall at "points of balance" within the two halves.

Watson also identifies specific parallels in the structuring of the books. His thesis is that with the revisions of 1674 Milton makes God's providence clearer, and that it was for the clarification of this important theme that the revision was made. The revision emphasizes God's ability to make good out of evil. For instance, the poem begins with evil, with the presentation of the fallen angels and their plot to destroy the world, and ends after that destruction with God's plan for the "paradise within." The centre of the poem, too, coming between Books VI and VII, stresses good out of evil, as the recounting of the war in heaven is quickly followed by the account of the creation of the world, which God purposed in order to re-supply the ranks of the angels; the result of the revolt of the angels, then, was the creation of mankind, just as the revolt of mankind makes possible the coming of Christ. Watson supports his claim that the structure of the poem itself clarifies Milton's justification of God's ways by enumerating various connections between Books I and XII and Books III and X. Both pairs work around the central books, about which much has already been said. The central books show most clearly God's ability to make good out of evil, but the surrounding books also contain parallels which make that point. He sees the struct ure as almost circular, with the end giving the sense of being back at the beginning.

Common to all these discussions of structure is the assert ion that the paralleling which makes up a great deal of that structure has a function in the meaning of the poem. Most agree as well that part of this function is to emphasize that more important than the immediate effects of the fall is the divine comedy of good resulting from evil.

What parallels in structure effect, then, is repeated stress on the poem's theme: the justification of God's ways to men.

What is missing in all these studies is a will to connect all levels of parallelism and a consideration of parallelism in Paradise Lost as a standard for the judgement of individual characters and actions. My thesis, then, will do two things: it will provide as comprehensive as possible a list of the parallels in the poem, and it will examine their uses. The second chapter will examine those epics with which Milton was familiar, to see to what extent Milton found a model for this aspect of Paradise Lost in the epic tradition. The next chapters will deal with Paradise Lost itself, each degree of the parallelism receiving separate treatment, while the conclusion will suggest what effect the combination of these many levels has on the whole poem, and on the judgements we must make of it. It is hoped that this study will draw attention to this insufficiently examined but essential area of the poem.

Notes

[1] "Parallelism" has been examined by the linguistic theorist Roman Jakobsen in "Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry," where he states that parallelism is the main problem of poetry. He means this very broadly, however, and includes under "parallelism" such elemental units as rhyme and meter as well as syntactic parallelism. Nicolas Ruwet's response to Jakobsen in "Parallelism and Deviation in Poetry" in fact, asserts that the kind of parallelism Jakobsen discusses is to be found elsewhere than in poetry: in music, for example, as well as in prose. He suggests, then, that as a linguistic term, "parallelism" is even more general, encompassing other literary and nonliterary genres. The parallels that I will examine are almost always at a much larger level than these: they include parallels of whole books and of groups of characters. Jakobsen's work is concerned with parallelism only as a signal of the poetic mode. I use the word to refer to three things: repeated key words and phrases, similarly described characters and events, and structural parallels.

[2] I do not, in fact, wish to argue that parallelism is actually present in every literary work. Indeed, in some writing there is a determined avoidance of the kind of orderly repetition, the imposed patterns of symmetry, harmony, and arrangement. I mean simply to state that parallelism can be of use only when its scope is limited.

[3] For a discussion of the paralleled structure of Tom Jones, see David Goldknopf's "The Failure of Plot in Tom Jones," where, despite his basic displeasure with the heart of the plot, he makes clear what the structural design of the novel is: six books in the country, six books in the city, and six in which the characters get from one to the other. For a discussion of Biblical parallelism, see my second chapter, as well as Berlin's The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism, Alter's The Art of Biblical Poetry, and Watters' Formula Criticism. The article on "Parallelism" in The Jewish Encyclopedia is a useful introduction.

[4] Adele Berlin makes this point about Biblical parallelism in The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism, p. 10.

[5] Galbraith Miller Crump's book The Mystic Design of Paradise Lost attempts such a comprehensive look, but only for the purpose of showing the presence of the symbolic circle at all levels in the poem. His main concern is not with the parallels themselves, but only with that one repeating element. Isabel MacCaffrey's Paradise

Lost as Myth, which I discuss at length elsewhere, also attempts to be comprehensive.

[6] See for example Richard DuRocher's Milton and Ovid, or Paul Stevens' Imagination and the Presence of Shakespeare in Paradise Lost. Helpful in these or any discussions of allusion are the alternate ways of thinking of influence proposed by Harold Bloom (influence as "anxiety" in The Anxiety of Influence,) Joseph Wittreich (influence as "illumination" in Angel of Apocalypse), and Thomas Greene (influence as "dialogue" in The Light in Troy). While Bloom's is the most eccentric of the three, relying more on a Freudian psychoanalysis of the Oedipal author than on an examination of the texts, some good work, such as DuRocher's, has proceeded from a temperate application of his notions.

[7] Isabel MacCaffrey's phrase "retrospection and anticipation" is also useful, but it has one limitation: it means to describe the function of the parallels solely within the chronological movement of the poem. That is, it refers to a parallel's ability to bring various other moments of time to bear on one moment. This function is important, but there are others as well. "Parallelism" is meant to be both inclusive and more neutral.

[8] Helen Darbishire is among those, including Alastair Fowler, who argue that Milton's preference for Latin over English is by no means as clear as Leavis, Pound, and Eliot would suggest. Lewis, on the other hand, always one to argue for decorum, allows that Milton altered the nature of English in Paradise Lost, but claims that he did so to make up an "all but ruinous" lack in his uninflected native tongue:

> The Miltonic constructions enable the poet to depart, in some degree, from this fixed order and thus to drop the ideas into his sentence in any order he chooses. (45)

[9] That is, Milton may have ignored part of English syntax, but for a good reason, because he wanted to do more than his native language would allow. And F.T. Prince, in tracing the influence of the Italian poets and theorists on Milton's blank verse, attributes the success of Milton's attempt to his imitation of the Italians combined with the natural variety of the English tongue, a variety lacking in the Italian language.

[10] When I say that the most frequent words are of Saxon origin, I am not referring merely to conjunctions and prepositions, but also to the most common nouns, adverbs, and adjectives. See Josephine Miles' Major Adjectives in English

Poetry from Wyatt to Auden for her lists. A glance at a concordance to Paradise Lost will also confirm the fact.

[11] Indeed, Shawcross goes so far as to use the numbering of books from the first edition, while relying on the more easily accessible second edition for line numbers, a choice which causes some confusion. Remarkably Alastair Fowler does the opposite, discussing the line numbers from the first edition and the book numbers from the second.

Chapter II

Parallelism and the Epic Tradition

In Chapter I, I quoted Robert Alter as saying that parallelism is present in all literature in one way or another. But the works which depend significantly on some kind of parallel, stylistic or structural, constitute a far smaller group. It is most useful to examine for parallelism those works in which parallelism plays a more active or obvious role than it does in most other literature. Its importance may be determined by its function in the communication or reinforcment of meaning and by how clearly it draws attention to itself.

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the epics and romances to which Milton owes other clear debts for examples of the kind of parallelism present in *Paradise Lost*. I begin with a number of questions: Can other epics be said to possess the kinds of parallels in style, character or structure -- that exist in *Paradise Lost*? In what way might Milton be the heir to such parallels? And is there something in the nature of the epic -- and perhaps the romance -- that invites paralleling? This chapter will concentrate on those models, examining in them the three aspects of paralleling in *Paradise Lost* which I will discuss later.[1] Particular attention will be given to Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, Virgil's *Aeneid*, Tasso's *Jerusalem Delivered*, and Spenser's

The Faerie Queene. The examination is to determine the extent to which Milton's extensive use of parallelism -- in books, characters, and diction -- develops the use made of it by his predecessors.

The debt Paradise Lost owes earlier poems varies depending on the kind of parallel. The greatest debt is clearly structural, in part by default; Milton's imitation of the verbal parallelism of earlier narrative poets besides Spenser is limited by the difference in language, while matters of structure may be above linguistic differences. And further, the larger structural paralleling -- that between books and characters -- is a characteristic of the epic: it is a habit adopted by Virgil and imitated by Milton. The genre of romance, to which both Tasso's and Ariosto's poems belong, requires a greater dramatic and not architectonic movement; the rigidity of a paralleled structure may be inappropriate. Further, this kind of paralleling is fit only for the "literary" or "secondary" epic. Its oral predecessor, by virtue of its modes of composition and delivery, requires other kinds of repetition to unify it. Even Milton's use of closely paralleled characters, aligned in complicated ways, may be found to some degree in those epics that demonstrate a paralleled structure.

The careful verbal repetitions demonstrated in some examples of the epic-romance tradition, however, seem to result from causes other than a continuation of the paralleled structure on a smaller level. Some verbal repetition facilitates composition itself, and its continued use in the post-oral tradition stems from a conscious will to imitate the pragmatic technique of oral verse-making for an aesthetic purpose; what had been a necessary poetic tool becomes ornamental when its primary function becomes obsolete. The three degrees of parallelism which are related in Milton's epic, then, originate in different areas of the epic-romance tradition. My discussion begins with a consideration of paralleled structure because many of the questions which will be raised about the paralleling of characters or about verbal repetition will depend to some extent on that structure.

Homer's epics mark the beginning of the epic tradition in western literature, but it is in those epics that imitate The Iliad and The Odyssey that many of the conventions now associated with the epic are established. For instance, common to all epics is a strong awareness of the epic as a genre and an equally strong desire to imitate the epics that had gone before. More than in any other genre, a poet wishing to write an epic will have in his mind the pattern established for him by earlier epic poets, even if he wishes, as Milton did, to alter that tradition significantly. The choice of the epic implies a concern for what has already been considered "epic." This strong concern for imitation comes after Homer, however; with Virgil begins one of the epic's conventions, the imitation of previous epic poets.

A strongly paralleled structure does not begin with Homer, although some balancing of books has been suggested for The Iliad. Its first book, for example, presents the beginning of Achilles' wrath and the journey of Thetis to Zeus, while in the last book the rage subsides after Zeus sends Thetis to Achilles. And in books II and XXIII, the second and second-last books, there is some balancing -- both begin with a dream -- but while in the first the dream leads to war, in the second it heralds the "friendly contests" of the Achaeans. C.M. Bowra suggests there may even be a parallel between the third book and the third book from the end, with the inconclusive fight between Menelaus and Paris in Book III mirroring the conclusive one between Achilles and Hector in Book XXII (106). To some extent, then, there may be the kind of structuring toward and away from a central point, like that noticed by Shawcross in Paradise Lost (see Chapter I), but such a pattern disappears in the middle books. The opening and closing books may be paralleled simply to give the sense that the end is approaching. Otherwise the structure seems to fall into three movements of varying length, with the wrath of Achilles threatening the success of the Achaeans from Books I-X, the defeat of the Achaeans becoming more likely through Books XI-XX, and the death of Patroclus in Book XVI leading to the involvement of Achilles in Book XX and the approach of the defeat of Troy.

The Odyssey has a narrative form different from that of The Iliad: the wayfaring rather than the warfaring. The end here will be the conquering of distance rather than of a town. And rather than the vicissitudes in the poem taking the form of greater and lesser success on the battlefield, the success in the wayfaring poem will depend on the movement towards the goal; even when Odysseus has arrived in Ithaca, there are still eleven books in which the completion of his journey, his revelation and vengeance on the suitors, is postponed. The only balancing there may be is in the two parts; Odysseus travels for twelve books, then arranges for the revelation of his homecoming in the last twelve.

That there are few or no larger structural parallels in these oral epics should not be surprising; to expect them is to apply the notion of what is appropriate in a written poem to an oral one. An essential difference comes from the oral methods of composition and delivery between this and the later epics.[2] The larger structures of a long poem that is meant to be read on the printed page can be more complex than in one which is to be heard. Other unifying devices, which will be discussed later, are more efficient in a poem composed orally. And such a poem would not usually have been delivered in its entirety at one sitting; rather, the poet would be requested to deliver smaller sections of the whole. As a result, efforts to connect large sections of the poem would not have been as successful.[3] Both the task of the poet and of the listener is different, then, in oral verse-making, and neither invites patterning on a large scale.

Virgil's epic is clearly meant to be an imitation of Homer's. He took the best from his original and made it his own, expanding his poem's scope to include the seeds of his contemporary Rome within the envelope of Aeneas' travels and travails. Some of the changes he made to his inherited form were the necessary results of a different subject and a different social context, but some were the result of a different kind of composition; his poem was written down, making it a "literary" (in Lewis' terms "secondary") epic. Writing a poem down allows a poet to impose more complicated structures; reading a poem allows the reader to perceive such structures more easily. One thing Virgil introduces to the epic, then, is a paralleled structure.

The multiple structures in The Aeneid have been often noticed. One of the most obvious of these is the combination of the two Homeric epics, including in its scope both the wayfaring of Odysseus and the warfare in Troy. Aeneas travels away from the Trojan war in the first six books, much as Odysseus does, although his journey is toward a new home rather than a long-lost one. In the last six books Aeneas is in Latium -- where he is destined to found the Roman Empire -- under siege by Turnus, which brings to the poem the warfaring of The Iliad. This combination of the two earlier epics divides the poem at its middle, but there are more such divisions.

In one such division the books are arranged in six pairs. Duckworth, whose discussion takes into account the arguments of Conway, Camps, Poschl, and Stadler, argues that the divisions do not depend on narrative movement alone, but on the relative importance of the books in the unfolding of Aeneas' destiny.[4] An important book is followed by a less important. The books with the most "tragic impact" (2) are Books II (the fall of Troy), IV (the tragedy of Dido), VI (the voyage to the underworld), VIII (the visit to early Rome), X (the great battle), and XII (the final conflict). Between these even-numbered books come those that relieve the tension between the books of greatest power. This alternation makes the more serious and tragic books "stand out in bold relief" (2). Stadler too recognizes the alternating rhythm, but sees in the even books less a greater seriousness and more a greater attention to the fate of the hero; in the other books other characters are more active. Either explanation is reasonable. This division, of course, corresponds to one that Barker finds in Paradise Lost, a division into six groups of paired books, where the end of each pair falls on some assertion of God's providence. In the Latin epic, however, the divisions are more clear.

There are two other clear patterns in the poem, both of which critics have also noted in Paradise Lost. One is the way Virgil binds the two halves of his poem together with a number of similarities.[5] Here is Duckworth's diagram of the connnections between books:

I. Juno and the storm
II. DESTRUCTION OF TROY
III. Interlude (of wandering)
IV. TRAGEDY OF LOVE
V. Games (lessening of tension)
VI. FUTURE REVEAL
II. Juno and war
VIII. BIRTH OF ROME
IX. Interlude (at Trojan camp)
X. TRAGEDY OF WAR

XI. Truce (lessening of tension)
XII. FUTURE ASSURED (7-8)

Furthermore, he disagrees with other critics, who, while noticing Book VI's significant move into the underworld, see it as an episode removed from the rest of the poem, an independent keystone; to him the book is also a crucial moment, but one which merely forms the climax of the first half and must be balanced by the poem's conclusion. He goes on to demonstrate an impressive number of parallels within the books that he believes balance one another (8-10). The combination of these two structures, the alternating and the paralleled, exemplifies the Virgilian principles of constrast, symmetry, and alternation, and yet another: the paralleling of the two halves reinforces the alternation, as there are more similarities between the paralleled even-numbered books than between the paralleled odd-numbered (10).

Yet a third pattern, again one noticed in *Paradise Lost* by Barker, is a tripartite division of the poem into groups of four books each: Books I-IV deal with Carthage, V-VIII with the arrival at Latium and the preparation for battle, and IX-XII with the conflict itself. Camps argues that the tripartite division arranges the paralleled lesser tragedies of Dido and Turnus around a central section where the "wider significance of the story is expounded,"[6] although he does not perceive the division at all times coming after exactly four books. Stadler and Poschl describe the threefold movement as one from dark to light and back to dark again (Duckworth 11). Duckworth argues too that there are parallels between the elements in the threefold division which connect these three as other parallels connect the two halves. The effect of this last division is a central emphasis on the fate of the Roman state.

Duckworth includes in his examination of the structure of the whole poem an analysis of the structures of individual books. He subscribes in part to a numerological reading of the internal construction of the books, arguing that in many passages the lines are balanced numerically towards and away from a central line, whereas some passages are divided in three rather than two. His conclusion, much like that of the numerological critics of Milton, is that Virgil composed on Pythagorean principles and that an examination of the golden mean in the poem may lead to a text which might be true to Virgil's proposed revisions, uncompleted because of his sudden death (103).[7]

One may draw two conclusions from this examination of the structure of Virgil's epic. First, it follows structural patterns very like those identified in Paradise Lost, and so Milton may be assumed to have recognized such patterns in The Aeneid and imitated them, in much the same way that Fielding imitated them in Amelia.[8] Milton appears to have borrowed from Virgil the three major divisions into six groups of two, three groups of four, and two groups of six, as well as the division of the poem into twelve books after the 1674 revision.[9] Secondly, even for the most unlikely conclusions critics draw about Paradise Lost there is precedent in the criticism of The Aeneid, which suggests that Milton's critics may imitate Virgil's critics as Milton im-itated Virgil.

Despite Tasso's claim that he worked within Virgil's epic tradition, the Italian "epic-romances" lack the symmetrical structure of Virgil's epic. Jerusalem Liberated, for instance, is divided into twenty books, but aside from the two uneven halves, there are few other clear divisions. In the first half the fortunes of the Christians look bleak: Rinaldo, once thought dead, is now known to be imprisoned by Armida and the pagans are initiating the battles. At the end of the tenth book, however, there is some hope. Many of the knights who had been seduced from their cause by Armida have returned, including the captured Tancred, and the illustrious future of Rinaldo is prophesied. Thus the compliment to the Este family occupies the central position in the poem. In the second half, the Christians are clearly on the offensive, but they have two related problems: they cannot penetrate the enchanted forest for much-needed wood, and Rinaldo, the only one who can conquer the forest, is still in Armida's clutches. This part moves logically to the conclusion: Rinaldo is rescued and the city is defeated with the help of the battering ram made from the wood of the enchanted forest which Rinaldo disenchants. But aside from this simple division into two, the events of the poem do not correspond to one another.

Indeed, Tasso can be said to follow more closely the narrative form of Ariosto than that of Virgil. The narrator of Orlando Furioso describes his own pattern not as a static structure with architectonic power but rather as a tapestry:

> Meseems that I have many threads to clear
> In the great web I labour evermore (XIII 81).

The reason for the number of threads is "change for delight":[10]

> As taste is quickened by variety,
> So it appears that, in the things I tell,
> The wider here and there my story ranges,
> It will be found less tedious for its changes. (XIII 80)

Although Tasso's poem lacks the degree of variety and change of the Orlando, its narrative encompasses far more "threads" than Virgil's, Homer's, or Milton's.

One example of the difference between the epic and romance narratives comes in the opening lines. In all the poems these lines attempt to summarize what will happen, to present the theme and the subject in brief. In The Iliad the subject is the anger of Achilles and the resulting destruction of Troy; in The Odyssey the muse is asked to "tell of the man of many ways." Virgil's poem begins "I sing of warfare and a man at war"; Milton's introduces the subject "Of man's first disobedience, and the fruit/ Of that forbidden tree." These are all specific, telling either of the poem's main action or of the main character. Ariosto's poem begins "Of Loves and Ladies, Knights and Arms, I sing,/ Of courtesies and many a daring feat." He goes on to mention Agramant, Charlemagne, Troyano, and Roland, adding to the general introduction the two "threads" of the war against Charlemagne and the madness of Roland. From the beginning, then, the poet warns that more than a single action will be his poem's subject.

Singleness or multiplicity of plot is a major difference between the genres of romance and epic that Renaissance apologists for the former noticed in part; in the one the number of knights involved and the nature of their adventures invite the constant meanderings in structure found in Ariosto and Tasso rather than the unity in the singular hero of Virgil's epic. Tasso attempts to give his poem some of this unity by emphasizing Godfrey's central place as the perfect governor, and by having much of the poem take place in one location for one reason. But Godfrey is not as interesting as a central character must be; in a poem whose subject is a holy war, those who make a difference on the battlefield attract most attention, and in a poem whose concern is also love, those who are involved in romantic entanglements will occupy the central place: characters such as Rinaldo, Tancred, Clorinda, and Argantes. Far more stanzas are dedicated to the exploits of a variety of knights than to Godfrey alone. And although the poem's subject appears to be single -- the conquest of Jerusalem -- many detours in the form of dungeons, islands, and enchanted forests must be overcome first, all of which lead the narrative away from that single goal.

Spenser's poem does not follow the form of the Italian romances, but neither are the parallels in its structure like those in Milton's. The story does not involve one constant set of characters as Paradise Lost does, nor does it involve a large set whose adventures appear intermittently through the poem, as in Tasso and Ariosto's poems: rather, it traces the adventures of a variety of knights, each of whom is central in a separate book. Most of the Faerie Queene's books are virtually self-contained. Prince Arthur is the unifying factor -- he involves himself in the adventures of each knight, often coming to the rescue, and he is to be the culmination of all the virtues those knights represent -- but, like Godfrey, he does not make his presence felt strongly enough to make the poem seem more a single story than a series of loosely related tales, nor does Spenser mean his poem to be so. When there are parallels between what happens in one book and what happens in the next, then, they are parallels that connect two separate narratives and two separate groups of characters.

But parallels there are, both in overall structure and within individual books. The difficulty one encounters upon looking into the structure of The Faerie Queene, however, is even greater than that presented by Milton's reorganization of his epic. Whether the epic is to be thought unfinished or, as Frye suggests, merely uncompleted,[11] only six of the projected twelve books exist.[12] The first three books appeared in 1590, the last, along with the first and some revisions, in 1596. One must determine whether from half of the intended poem the structure of the whole may be inferred, or whether that idea lies forever hidden in the unwritten last book, where Spenser said all his knights would be reunited at the court of the Faerie Queene.

The question has given rise to various theories. J. H. Walter postulates a nonextant primitive text; the copy we have would represent Spenser's later attempts to alter his material, with the result that a number of narrative inconsistencies crept in and were not caught.[13] As well, references to the content of the poem made by Spenser's contemporaries, which are sometimes inconsistent with the text we have, err because they refer to the lost earlier version.[14] As W.J.B. Owen points out, however, it is unnecessary to postulate another text to explain errors in the narrative logic; such errors probably suggest not radical revision but rather a lack of it. Even Owen, though, is distressed enough about the difficulties to offer his own theory about the text's composition: he believes that it was composed in two sections. The third and fourth book, following the model of Ariosto, were written first and then appended to the publication of the later material, Books I, II, V, and VI, which follow the model of Virgil. In the eyes of both critics, the existing poem is the result of accidental errors and careless organization.

On the other hand, there are those who would defend the poem as finished in some significant way. Avoiding speculation about what might have been written, they defend the six books we have as a cohesive and recognizable unit. Alastair Fowler, for example, argues that the six books along with the "Mutability Cantos" form a series which follows seven planetary deities and their associated days of the week. Northrop Frye has a theory based on patterns of imagery which he says unify the books that do exist. He argues that when Spenser changed his projected number of books from twenty-four to twelve, he combined the private and public virtues in his first six; the first three, then, do form a unit, each presenting an allegory of a private virtue, while the last three form a second unit, concentrating on three of the public virtues. There is even a pattern within these two groups. Friendship, the first in the second half, is the most private of the public virtues and justice the most public; courtesy combines the two. Holiness, too, is most dependent on God's grace, while Temperance can be present in the enlightened heathen; again the third -- Chastity -- combines the two (115). The first half, then, parallels the second, accentuating the differences between the two kinds of virtue. Even if the next six books would have repeated the pattern, these first six can stand alone.

Apparently independently, Thomas P. Roche arrived at similar conclusions, although he took the patterning of the books two steps further. His book aims to show that Books III and IV do not represent a falling-off from the regular structural pattern obvious in Books I and II, but rather follow a different principle. He believes that the poem divides not only into the two published groups of three, but also into three groups of two. Holiness and Temperance are paired - as A.S.P. Woodhouse conclusively shows -- by their belonging to the orders of grace and nature respectively; Chastity and Friendship show the "proper use of love in individuals and between human beings" (200); and Books V and VI show "the claims of law and right on society as opposed to society's courteous attention, lovingly offered, to go beyond the minimal demands of duty" (200). Yet a third pattern exists, one which again has the poem fall into two groups of three books each, but in which each book in the first half has its match in a book in the second half, I with VI, II with V, III with IV. Temperance and Justice, for instance, deal with the proper ordering of the body and of the body politic respectively. It is interesting too that without, it seems, knowing it, Roche has mimicked Shawcross' conclusions about the balanced structure of Paradise Lost.

In The Faerie Queene, then, Milton may have found a model for his structure, though Virgil is a likelier candidate because the mode of Spenser's poem means that the parallels will have a different effect. As discussed in Chapter I, the paralleling of books in Paradise Lost involves similarities between events and characters that have a direct influence on one another. The fall of the angels can be thought a direct cause of the paralleled fall of man; the seduction of Eve both parallels and is caused by the seduction of the angels; Christ's offer of sacrifice comes because God knows that Satan will offer himself to pervert Adam and Eve. All these parallels are part of a clearly connected narrative. The same is true of parallels in The Aeneid. In The Faerie Queene, however, the parallels between books link narratives connected by the allegorical ordering of the virtues and the occasional appearance of Arthur. They do not bear on one another directly.

A look at the two books which have been most exhaustively paralleled, books I and II, will demonstrate the point. The two knights, Redcrosse and Guyon, follow a remarkably similar course in their quests: each knight sets out from the court of the Faerie Queene with a guide (Una and the Dwarf) and fights and overcomes two enemies (Sansfoy and Sansloi; Pyrochles and Cymochles); he enters a place of temptation (the House of Pride and the Cave of Mammon), falls, and must be rescued by Arthur (who frees each knight in canto viii of each book); a period of recovery follows at a place of instruction (the House of Holiness and the House of Alma) after which the knight is competent to fulfil his task (the killing of the dragon and the destruction of the Bower of Bliss) (Hamilton 1958 327). Although A.S.P. Woodhouse, in "Nature and Grace in The Faerie Queene," is not the first to notice the parallels, it is he who first attributes to the parallels some significance in the understanding of the two books. His thesis is that the two books operate on two separate levels, the level of grace -- which has to do with revealed religion, and man as a supernatural being -- and the level of nature, where man is seen as a creature of this world and all that is known is perceived through the senses (195). In the first two books, then, Spenser "emphasizes the parallels between them, and the differences which only these parallels can bring into relief" (202). The differences explain why the Redcrosse Knight escapes from Lucifera (Pride) only to be captured by Orgoglio (also Pride); in the first case the pride is worldly, and Redcrosse does not succumb, but he is susceptible to spiritual pride. What the parallels do, then, is make clear the two separate levels of human existence by pointing out the differences in the educational processes of the two knights. The Redcrosse Knight's actions are to be understood in the context of the realm of grace, Guyon's in the context of the world of nature. But the parallels cease their functions here. Once the levels are established, the reactions of the separate knights do not influence how we read the actions of the others, nor do those actions affect the other's actions themselves. It is almost as if the two knights were characters in different texts. The principle of allusion discussed earlier applies here. The two knights are admittedly closer to one another than characters from completely different works are, yet they are not as close as two characters who operate in the same narrative, such as Eve and Satan. The structural paralleling in Spenser's epic, then, is limited by two things, one deliberate and one accidental. The poems' general structure of the adventures of a number of knights errant connected by a frame story will allow the books to be balanced in a looser way than the single story in Paradise Lost will, and the possible paralleling of the whole poem is lost to us because the poem does not fulfil its promise of twelve books.

Once the similarity in structure between *Paradise Lost* and *The Aeneid*, as well as *The Faerie Queene*, is established, a question remains whether the similarity extends to the paralleling of characters in those works. The possibility certainly exists that Milton took his technique of paralleling epic characters from Virgil. Homer's characters work more like separate entities in the poems, but there are certainly parallels to be drawn between the two tragic characters Dido and Turnus, who each occupy a central place in Aeneas' journey in the two paralleled sections of the poem: Dido in I-IV and Turnus in VIII-XII. So paralleled the two must be compared, especially in their potentially destructive power over Aeneas: Dido's love is as much of a threat to the founding of Rome as Turnus' war is, and in the conflicts Aeneas destroys the representatives of both. There are other parallels and contrasts: Aeneas turns deceitfully from the entanglement with Dido while he faces the clash with Turnus. Dido kills herself while Turnus is killed directly by Aeneas. Even Lavinia may be worked into the pattern. Creusa, lost before the action of the poem begins, predicts "Glad peace, a kingdom, and a queen" for Aeneas (II.1017), and both Dido and Turnus are threats to the fulfilment of the prophesy; Dido offers herself and her kingdom, the false goal, while Turnus actively attempts to keep Aeneas from the real kingdom and queen, Latium and Lavinia. It had even been suggested, in Medieval allegorizings of the poem, that the three "queens" -- Creusa the late wife, Dido the common-law wife, and Lavin ia the prophesied wife -- represent the three continents over which Rome will eventually have dominion: Asia Minor, Africa, and Europe.

The parallels cannot be much further developed, however. Dido's actions are separate from Turnus'; the actions of one do not help explain the actions of the other. Another difference between the parallels in this poem and in Milton's is that the two characters who are most clearly paralleled, Dido and Turnus, have nothing to do with one another. Dido is dead before Turnus comes on the scene. They are far more separate than are Christ and Satan, for example, who are constantly in play from before the beginning of the poem to long after its end, in the prophesied second coming.

Some characters are paired off against each other in Jerusalem Liberated: Argantes and Tancred (Tancred finally kills Argantes), Tancred and Clorinda (Tancred finally kills Clorinda), Erminia and Clorinda (the two both love Tancred, both become Christians, and Erminia disguises herself as Clorinda), and Godfrey and Soliman (the two leaders). In almost all of these cases the pairings are between opponents, one pagan and one Christian, and their connections come primarily through the appropriateness of their strengths. Clorinda and Argantes, for instance, are the strongest warriors on the pagan side, and Tancred on the Christian. The few women in the poem are grouped too; the three most prominent of the five women who appear in the poem are pagans, the two Christians being Sophronia and the illfated Gildippes, neither of whom appears in more than one book. The pagans are more interesting. All three are in love with Christian knights, although the love of Armida and Clorinda is more threatening than that of Erminia. And all three decide to become Christians at the end of their lives or the end of the poem. The presence of these women aids in the pairing of two of the Christian knights too. Rinaldo and Tancred, along with Godfrey, are the most admirable in the Christian camp; they are necessary for different parts of the victory, Rinaldo primarily for disenchanting the forest, which he cannot do until he has overcome his temptation on Armida's island, and Tancred primarily for his defeating of the pagan side's two best warriors, while Godfrey is the necessary good leader. The two warriors on the Christian side are threatened by their love for the pagan women. Rinaldo is taken from the scene of the battle and Tancred finds himself fighting Christian attackers who threaten Clorinda. Tancred is also rendered unable to penetrate the enchanted forest because of his love for Clorinda; he hears her spirit in one of the trees and cannot bring himself to chop it down. Clorinda, of course, also threatens Tancred directly, fighting him in hand-to-hand combat. Love in Tasso's poem, then, is a definite threat to the Christian victory. Once again, though, when Tasso contrasts characters, the contrast is not as constant nor as important as it is in Paradise Lost. Tancred, Rinaldo and Godfrey represent three strengths, with Rinaldo and Tancred also demonstrating three weaknesses.

Although the paralleling of separate books in The Faerie Queene may be different from the parallels in Paradise Lost's balanced structure, the principle of paralleling with in books does resemble that in the later epic. Such paralleled characters abound in the allegory, often in the form of similarly named corresponding characters -- Sansjoy, Sansloi, and Sansfoy; Priamond, Diamond, and Triamond -- or similarly named opposites -- Una and Duessa, Fidelia and the false Fidessa. There are, then, two easily discernible kinds of relationships between the characters: they may represent qualities which belong together -- faith, hope, and charity -- or they may show opposition -- Fidelia and Sansfoy, Speranza and Sansjoy, and Charissa and Sansloi. Such paralleling comes more naturally in an allegorical poem than in Milton's. A character's actions will be in some way determined by the quality he represents, so the pairing of such characters will also depend on those qualities.

There are some larger parallels between characters that extend beyond the boundaries of the individual books. Britomart and Arthur, for instance, are paired by their joint destiny in beginning the line of kings which will lead to the Tudor line. And Britomart's quest is not like that of the other knights. While the Redcrosse Knight and Guyon must redress a wrong, Britomart searches for Arthegall. But her quest is not one suited only to a warrior-woman: Arthur's quest for Gloriana mirrors hers, with the man seeking the woman instead of the woman seeking the man. As her adventures bridge the divisions between Books III and V, then, they parallel the larger bridging adventure of Arthur's search for the Faerie Queene, which spans the whole poem. The parallel does more than add some unity to the poem; the adventures are paralleled for reason of the historical allegory. As Thomas Roche argues, the history of British kings is given in retrospect by Arthur (Book II) and in prophesy by Merlin to Britomart:

> Historically this solution does least violence to the chronicle material, since Conan, the son of Britomart and Arthegall, takes the crown away from his cousin Constantius, Arthur's successor. (48)

The result of the parallel, Roche writes, is that Spenser is able to present Elizabeth, the descendant of Britomart, as connected in some way to Arthur as well. Elizabeth is descended from Britomart and Britomart is equated with Arthur: Elizabeth can thus claim symbolic descent from Arthur as well. Of course, Elizabeth wins both ways, as she also provides the model for Gloriana. She is like Arthur, Britomart, and Gloriana (not to mention Belphoebe) and is symbolically married to Arthegall/Justice. One of the motives of Spenser's parallelism in his allegory is to deliver complicated compliments.

The parallels in The Faerie Queene, then, connect whole books and individual characters, but the differences between Spenser's techniques and Milton's are largely the result of the differences in the mode and the organization of the poems. The unity of Milton's poem satisfies the epic requirement in The Poetics: all material in the poem presents or supports a single action. Each book, then, depends on those around it for its beginning, middle, and end. But, as W.J.B. Owen suggests, The Faerie Queene has several beginnings, several middles, and several endings (1087). Most of the books could stand alone, with some small changes, as individual tales connected by a frame story, the quest of Arthur for Gloriana, and an intended purpose, the fashioning of a gentleman. It presents the multiple actions appropriate for a romance, but here the actions are multiple in a way different from that of the romances of Ariosto and Tasso, which contain a greater interweaving of narratives. Parallels between such books will therefore be less striking than in a poem with a single action, where the components of that one action are shown to be alike. Parallels between characters will also be different. Spenser's poem has the addition of a historical and a nationalistic level, in which the queen could situate herself. By using allegory he combines the dynastic attention of Ariosto and Tasso's romances -- Elizabeth is descended from these noble characters as the Este family is descended from the knights at the crusades -- with a stronger allegorical association: Belphoebe is Elizabeth in her private virtues, and Britomart is Elizabeth in her public. The allegory also makes the characters, representations of virtues and vices, more easily paired with their opposites and their counter parts. They will behave largely as they are supposed to, and so comparing Una and Duessa will not yield the same results as a comparison between Eve and Satan. Even when the pairing is of two characters who are not each other's opposites or exact counterparts, as in the paralleling of Sir Guyon and the Redcrosse Knight, it usually shows ways in which the two qualities the two characters represent are either similar or different; the movements of Redcrosse show that he is on the level of grace while Guyon operates on the natural level.

From the level of the characters we move to the smaller level of repeated words and phrases. Here there is a clear precedent in Homer, but although Homer's poetry exhibits a remarkable amount of verbal repetition, especially in the form of fixed epithets, a difference must be drawn between such repetition in oral poetry and its counterpart in written works. Much work has been done, most notably by Milman Parry, on the repeated use of verbal formulae in Homer's epics, a formula being "a group of words which is regularly employed under the same metrical conditions to express a given essential idea" (272). Parry distinguishes, however, between repetition and formulae, arguing that the former is an ornament of the poetry, the latter a means of making it. He finds in Homer's works a system of formulae so complicated that it could not, he suggests, come from a single man; he therefore defends the notion of "Homer" as a combination of a number of poets whose works were compiled into two epics. He argues as well that critics usually reject the idea that the formulae are merely a necessity of oral composition because it is believed that such a notion would call into question Homer's conscious art.[15]

There is one other work in which such formulae have been discussed which was familiar to Milton: the Bible. Much of the work on Biblical parallelism in the last twenty years, in fact, has used Milman Parry's research as a basis, although the two forms of poetry do differ. The Jewish Encyclopedia defines such parallelism as a "regularly recurring juxtaposition of symmetrically constructed sentences" (v.9, 520). Robert Lowth, the first man to identify the parallels, wrote that Hebrew verses demonstrate parallels when they treat one subject in many different ways, and dwell upon the same sentiment; when they express the same thing in different words, or different things in a similar form of words; when equals refer to equals, and opposites to opposites. (The Jewish Encyclopaedia v9 521)

Among those who have examined the parallelism, Robert Alter, in The Art of Biblical Poetry, does most to get at the device's aesthetic effect. One of his translated examples is this:

> Will your steadfast care be told in the grave,
> Your care in perdition?
> Will your wonders be known in the darkness,
> Your bounty in the land of oblivion?

He argues that even in verses that seem most static, the parallelism suggests the impulse to narrative: the parallel is rarely a mere repetition, but usually intensifies or qualifies the preceding line (40). One difference between the conclusions reached by Biblical and Homeric scholars is that the Biblical do not see the parallelisms in the Bible as the result of an oral tradition or as an oral versemaking tool. Rather, they point to the flexibility of the Biblical word pairs (Alter 1985 12; Watters 25).

What this kind of parallelism and the verbal repetition in Homer have in common is their frequency. The frequency may be attributed to Homer in its necessity to the act of spontaneous composition within strict metrical boundaries, and in the Old Testament to the predominant Hebrew poetic technique. In either case it appears far more often than any similar verbal repetition in later epics. Comparable might be the frequency of rhyme in Spenser or of iambic pentameter lines in Milton.

Virgil's desire to imitate the repetitive nature of Greek verse is clearer, however. In his attempt to create a Roman epic like Homer's Greek epics he imitated some of what he perceived to be Homer's verse style. This repetition, though, no longer necessary for the production of the verse, becomes two things: an ornament of the poem, alloting stress through the repetition of phrases, and a conscious imitation of the technique of the earlier epics. Walter Moskalew, however, argues that it is not merely the dubious artistic motive of imitation of the older poet that produced the vast number of parallels in The Aeneid: rather, the number of repetitions represents a shifting in his artistic style, and represents not laziness but an attempt to connect various elements of the poem and to reinforce others.

The literary or secondary epic is one of the most formal of all literary genres, with its required set of elements: the invocation, epic simile, descent into Hell, heightened language. Owing to the presence of active divinities and the usual importance attributed to Fate, destiny or divine order, even the most noticeably constructed corresponding patterns will not appear inappropriate. Rather, they will reinforce the idea that God or the gods work in man's life, arranging human history in a meaningful pattern. Parallelism, then, is a device particularly suitable to the epic, but it was not until Paradise Lost that its full potential was tapped.

Notes

[1] My ability to discern parallels in design and between characters will be greater than my ability to notice paralleled words and phrases in non-English narratives; my knowledge of Greek, Latin and Italian is not good enough.

[2] For an examination of the nature of oral verse-making, see Milman Parry's two articles in The Making of Homeric Verse. C.S. Lewis also discusses the constraints of the oral and the written epics, which he calls the primary and secondary epics, in A Preface to Paradise Lost.

[3] Milton's poem would also rarely be read at one sitting, but the obvious advantage a reader has over an auditor is the ability to reread or refer back.

[4] The studies Duckworth summarizes are Viktor Poschl's Die Dichtkunst Virgils: Bild und Symbol in der Aeneis (Innsbruck: de Gruyter, 1950), W.A. Camps' "A Note on the Structure of the Aeneid (CQNS 4 (1954): 214-15), R.S. Conway's Harvard Lectures on the Vergilian Age (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1928), and T.W. Stadler's Vergils Aeneis: Ein Poetische Betrachtung (Einsiedlen, 1942).

[5] Duckworth protests that it is the school tradition of studying The Aeneid in only one of its two halves that obscures the obvious connections between the two (3).

[6] Quoted in Duckworth (2), from "A note on the Structure of the Aeneid," 215.

[7] Here the theory most resembles those of later editors of Milton, such as Bentley, Darbishire, and Wright, who attempt to "restore" Milton's text to what it would have been had he not been blind and thus unable to supervise printing carefully. For a discussion of the problems of these three editors, see Gordon Moyles' The Text of Paradise Lost.

[8] While Tom Jones is a "comic epic in prose," it is in Amelia that Fielding tries in earnest to combine epic and novel.

[9] Of course, the simple fact of borrowing a structure of twelve books will suggest natural divisions into 2, 3, 4, and 6.

[10] A. Bartlett Giamatti discusses the point in his introduction to Orlando Furioso.

[11] Frye explains the distinction between an "uncompleted" work and an "unfinished": "If merely uncompleted, then it still may be a unity like a torso in sculpture; if unfinished, then, as in Dickens' Mystery of Edwin Drood, certain essential clues to the total meaning are forever withheld from us" (109).

[12] That twelve books were intended is clear from the 1596 title page – The Faerie Queene / Divided into twelue bookes / fashioning / XII. Morall virtues –

and sonnet 80, in which he calls his published six books "half fordonne." From his letter to Ralegh in 1589, however, he makes it clear that he has a total of more than twelve, perhaps twenty-four, in mind: "I labour to portraict in Arthur, before he was king, the image of a braue knight, perfected in the twelue private mora;; vertues, as Aristtole hath deuised, the which is the purpose of these first twelue bookes: whiche if I finde to be well accepted, I may be perhaps encouraged, to frame the other part of pollliticke vertues in his person, after that he came to be king" (Hamilton 737).

[13] An example of such narrative inconsistency is Red crosse's multiple promises in Book I: he has agreed to marry Una and he has agreed to serve the Faerie Queene for six years. But in the House of Holiness, after he is denied permanent residence, he makes another vow:

> Then shall I soone, (quoth he) so God me grace,
> Abet that virgins cause disconsolate,
> And shortly back return unto this place,
> To walk this way in Pilgrim's poor estate. (I.x.64)

No attempt is made to reconcile the three vows, and although they are not necessarily mutually exclusive -- Redcrosse might serve the Faerie Queene, marry Una and then return to the House of Holiness -- the "soon" in Redcrosse's speech suggests that he intends no lifetime delay. The problem may just be one of the allegorical level's incompatability with the literal -- the virtue Redcrosse represents could be united with Una and in the House of Holiness at the same time but J.H. Walter thinks that Spenser simply changed his mind; he intended Redcrosse to return to the House of Holiness, but then required a way to have all the knights return to the Faerie Queene's court in the last book.

There are other inconsistencies too, most of which suggest carelessness rather than revision. Satyrane and Sansloi, for instance, fight in Book I, and the narrator says he will delay telling the outcome of the fight. Later the two characters reappear, but no mention of the fight, or its outcome, is made.

[14] The best example of such an inconsistency comes in Spenser's own letter to Ralegh, where what he says will happen in Book II does not.

[15] Parry goes so far as to suggest that to find a modern poet who used an aid to composition similar to Homer's, one would have to go to Milton. Although Milton was blind and dictated his verse, his epic was not an oral one. He would, according to biographical sources, dictate as many as forty lines at a time, often

cutting out half that many. He had, then, the ability to edit his text -- an ability oral poets, because of the nature of their delivery, did not have.

Chapter III

Paralleled Words and Phrases

The epic, with its broad scope and elevated language, depends largely on small effects to unify it. The parallelism which unifies Paradise Lost begins with single words or phrases the frequent appearances of which create an underlying pattern connecting all parts of the poem. These words are often simple ones, but they are woven so carefully into the fabric of the epic that an examination of any individual repeated word uncovers much fruitful material. Isabel MacCaffrey suggests that Milton recalls or anticipates words

> whenever the associations clustering round them were relevant to the context. The most important event in a series could be placed at a structural key point, regardless of its "actual" chronological position. The place of an incident in the reader's experience is thus determined in Paradise Lost not by its temporal weight, but by its mythic charge, demanding that it appear and reappear in several of the expanding circles raying out from the initial statement. (82)

In her scheme, then, one word, which may elsewhere in the poem have gained important associations, can, by the simple fact of its introduction into a new context, bring with it the dowry of its earlier significance. These key words alert the reader to something of importance, such as the workings of Providence or the approach of the fall.[1]

The problem with a study that wishes to examine the place of all such significant repeated words or phrases in Paradise Lost is that an exhaustive study in a poem of 10,000 lines is almost impossible. The corresponding problem is that if one simply chooses some examples, one has not clearly established the uniform character of the verse. This chapter will try to steer the middle course to demonstrate Milton's repetitive technique.

The phrase "significant repetition" suggests that I do not wish simply to identify all those words that Milton uses more than once, or even all those words that appear most often. While there may be some conclusions about Milton's verse style to be drawn from the fact that "and" is the most common word in the poem, such are not the conclusions towards which I want to work. "Significant repetition" means the repetition of a word that, through its frequency as well as the occasions of its appearances, when examined, illuminates some aspect of the poem's meaning. Repeated phrases need appear far less often to be significant; they will be more obvious because they are less likely to reappear accidentally.[2]

The key words I will discuss come from a number of different groups. The word "hand" has a part to play in revealing the unity of prelapsarian humanity; it works on its own. Other words work in opposition to one another, such as "light" and "dark," "good" and "evil," or "life" and "death," or belong to a group of opposed words, words of height and depth or of happiness and woe. This chapter will examine one of these last, the repetition of "woe" and its opposites "happy" and "bliss." The final significant repetition to be examined is the poem's most well-constructed pattern: the arrangement of vegetative imagery, especially the words "root," "tree," "flower," "fruit," and "seed."

The word "hand" frequently appears to point out a connection between characters. It (or "hands" or "handed") appears 99 times in the poem, usually as a metonymy for someone performing an action, as when it is said of Mammon's architectural abilities in Book I that "his hand was known / In Heav'n by many a Tow'red structure high" (732-3). But there are two significant uses of the word which in both cases signify relationship between characters. The one which Milton develops from his source is the situation of the Son at the Father's right hand, the position of honour and of indispensable aid (as in III.279,V.606, VI.747,762,892,X.64). Satan, always attempting to mirror God, has two substitutions for these two highest members of the universal hierarchy. First in the poem (though not in chronological order) is Sin's assumption of Christ's place with Satan as God:

> thou wilt bring me soon
> To that new world of light and bliss, among
> The Gods who live at ease, where I shall Reign
> At thy right hand voluptuous, as beseems
> Thy daughter and thy darling, without end. (II.866-70)

Satan's earlier suggestion, as Raphael tells it in Book V, reduces the Father-Son alliance to one within Satan himself:

> Our puissance is our own, our own right hand
> Shall teach us highest deeds. (864-5)

Satan and Sin, then, present two parodies in opposition to God's revelation of the Son at his right hand, and both parodies reveal Satan's own position: he attempts to be self-sufficient, to rely on his own "right hand," and yet Sin, his offspring as the Son is God's, is claimed as his indispensable lieutenant. His assumption of the "right hand" is ironic given his "sinister" designs and given that Hell is on, we are told in Book X, the "left hand" (322). The Son's position at the right hand of the Father is familiar enough that Satan's use of the right hand should strike a chord. "Handedness" in Heaven and Hell, then, emphasizes the heirarchical as well as the dependent relationships between their main characters.

While the situation in Hell shows Satan's continuing at tempts to parody the divine, the appearances of "hands" in Paradise reveal an arrangement different in kind. Here the meaning of "hands" develops more clearly the status of the relationship between Adam and Eve. At times of peace, their perfect union is stressed by their connection to each other at the hands, a symbol which Kester Svendsen identifies as a recurrent image of unity in literature (111). After the separate introductory descriptions of each character in Book IV, they appear together:

> So hand in hand they pass'd, the loveliest pair
> That ever since in love's imbraces met. (321-2)

In Book IV, they are seen "talking hand in hand" as "alone they pass'd / On to thir blissful Bower" (689-90), and "Handed they went, and eased the putting off" of clothes (IV.739). That sign of their union precedes another, their innocent sexual union, and their nakedness, which Milton praises, will allow them to avoid dropping their hands in order to fiddle with clothing. Two other symbols of their unfallen natures -- innocent sexuality and an absence of encumbering clothes -- cooperate in the general representation of a healthy union by the joining of hands.[3] We later learn that this sign of unity was present at their first encounter; Adam had said "Part of my Soul I seek thee, and thee claim / My other half," and Eve recalls that "with that thy gentle hand / Seiz'd mine, I yielded (IV.487-90). Adam makes real his assertion of their oneness -- she is his "other half" -- by taking her hand.[4] His action parallels one we know to have occurred at Adam's own creation: God took him "by the hand" and placed him in Paradise (VIII.300). In Book V, too, Adam awakens Eve gently by "her soft hand touching" (17), a comforting sign of union that comes, as Eve then reveals, after a disquieting dream, a dream in which she is tempted to be separate from Adam. Dreams themselves may be taken as a sign of individual rather than community experience, and Adam's gesture reconfirms upon waking a unity threatened during sleep. The nature of Adam and Eve's perfect union is reflected in their garden, in the simultaneity of the seasons; Autumn, Spring, and Summer "danc'd hand in hand (V.395).[5]

As the threat of the fall grows stronger in Book IX, there is a corresponding parting of hands. It is Eve's imagined need of other "hands" her term and Adam's for the progeny promised them (IV.629, IX.203, 207, 623) -- that leads to their initial separation in their work. Adam insists that their combined abilities will be adequate to the task:

> These paths and Bowers doubt not but our joint hands
> Will keep from Wilderness with ease, as wide
> As we need walk, till younger hands ere long
> Assist us. (IX.244-47)

When they part, the narrator draws attention to the hands: "Thus saying from her Husband's hand her hand / Soft she withdrew" (IX.385-6). At her fall it is Eve's "rash hand" that was "in evil hour / Forth reaching to the Fruit" (IX.780-1). She carries back the fruit "in her hand" (850), and when she tells Adam what she has done, he drops the garland "from his slack hand" (892). At length convinced, he "scrupl'd not to eat" what she gave him "with liberal hand" (IX.997). In the resulting lust "her hand he seized and to a shady bank" they went (1037). Both the seizing of the hand and the sexual union provide useful contrasts to their so lately lost innocence. When Adam had earlier "seized" Eve's hand, it was with a "gentle hand" (IV.488), and while their earlier sexual acts had been pure, they are now "play." Significantly, Adam, in his loquacious excuse to the Son for his actions, blames his trust in Eve, stating that "from her hand I could suspect no ill" (140). Their separation is not permanent, however, and after they are reconciled, they leave the garden "hand in hand, with wand'ring steps and slow"(648).

Throughout, then, the status of the human pair's relationship is expressed by, among other things, their joining or separating of hands. Hands appear at crucial moments in the history of their garden life: at their meeting, after the Satan-induced dream, as they are first seen by both us and Satan, during their fateful discussion in Book IX, in the fall itself, and in their reconciliation. It is worth noting that, while Adam is repeatedly called Eve's superior, the repeated image of the hands joining usually signifies equality -- in Adam's words, two halves of one whole -- while the "handedness" in both Heaven and Hell involves a central figure with another at his right hand. Milton stresses the unity of the marriage before the fall, so that the separation scene may emphasize a metaphoric as well as physical separation.

In the significant repetition of the word "woe," there is something rather remarkable; as E. E. Stoll has suggested in "Time and Space in Milton," the leitmotif of "all our woe" occurs in a number of cases "in the same prominent place in the meter" (424). Indeed, the phrase "all our woe" recurs three times, two times in the last foot and a half of the line; a similar phrase, "all this woe," finds itself also at the end of the metrical line. Even more than this, though, the word "woe" itself appears most often -- twenty-three out of a possible thirty-four times -- as the last syllable in a line. MacCaffrey suggests that such "echoed cadences" as Stoll has noticed in "all our woe" are important "since poets certainly 'think' in rhythms and wordless tunes very often, and the coincidence of word and cadence imposes recollection on the alert reader" (84). Thus in the use of the word "woe," it is not only the word itself which connects the instances of its appearances, but also the position in the line, which should serve to make the recurrence more noticeable.[6]

That the recurrence is apparent to MacCaffrey's careful reader is far less important than the reason for the recurrence. The word appears at significant moments in the tragic movement of the poem. Its first appearance is, of course, in the poem's first words, describing the fruit "whose mortal taste / Brought Death into the World, and all our woe" (I.2- 3). That initial appearance is echoed in the words of the devils, who in their debates in Books I and II repeatedly refer to the "woe" in which they now find themselves; it is a major factor in their debate, as they have to determine whether action will cause them less or more woe.

Satan carries the preoccupation with woe out of Hell with him; it is like a contagion, as the narrator signals "His journey's end and our beginning woe" (III.633). Satan's soliloquies in Eden show that woe is on his mind. He equates love and hate since to him either "deals eternal woe" (IV.70), and he imagines the depths of the woe into which he will introduce Adam and Eve:

> Ah gentle pair, yee little think how nigh
> Your change approaches, when all these delights
> Will vanish and deliver ye to woe,
> More woe, the more your taste is now of joy. (IV.366-9)

He understands the tragic problem, that the greater the happiness before the fall, the greater the woe after.[7] Raphael at the end of his visit warns Adam about the possibility of falling, saying "The weal or woe in thee is plac't" (VIII.638), and in warning Adam of what might come reminds the reader of what is to come.

In Book IX the Tree of Knowledge is the "root of all our woe" (645), an appropriate pun that recalls the first lines in which the "fruit of that forbidden tree" brought "all our woe." When Eve considers after her fall what to do about Adam, she decides that "Adam shall share with me in bliss or woe" (831), and Adam uses the same words when he decides to eat with Eve: "from thy State / Mine never shall be parted, bliss or woe" (IX. 915-16). When Eve recognizes her own guilt she calls herself "sole cause to thee of all this woe" (X.935) and when the Devils are punished it is again the likeness of the tree of Knowledge, now multiplied in an orchard, sent to "work them furder woe or shame" (X.555)[8] After the book of repentance and judgement -- Book X -- "woe" seldom appears: only twice in Book X.[9] It is a word conspicuously absent from the last and most hopeful book. Indeed, it is the word Milton associates with the tragic movement of the poem, which must disappear in the providential last books.

MacCaffrey's conclusions about the important uses of the word "woe" are these:

> As the key turns to release Satan from his prison (through gates never to be closed until the last judge ment); as God pronounces the fatal prohibition; as Milton, foreseeing the catastrophe, changes "these notes to tragic"; as Eve is led to the tree; as the full awareness of her sin darkens her consciousness; as woe overtakes the original sinners in Hell -- at each of these points, another knot of the pattern is tied, and a network of implications is spread over the poem (85).

Thus "woe" appears as a sign at specific moments in the tragedy of Paradise Lost, and serves to connect the narrator's prolepses, the devils' torment, the fall itself and its immediate consequences.

Stoll notices the "duplicity of effect" caused by the emphasis on "woe" in the poem: "When the human pair were happy and guiltless, woe hung over them; once fallen, it is hope instead" (424). It is true that the repetition of "woe" in the devils' books and in the narrator's words look forward to the woe to come, just as in the later books Michael, Adam, and the narrator look forward to the release from woe, but the stronger contrast to future "woe" is present "happiness" or "bliss." And while the general term for the fallen tribulation of both men and angels is that single "woe," two terms share the responsibility for representing the joyous unfallen state: "happy" most often for prelapsarian mankind and "bliss" most often for the joy in Heaven.

By far the majority of 91 uses of the word "happy" or its cognates (happiness, happier, happiest) describe the state of Paradise or its inhabitants before the fall[10] The garden itself is repeatedly a "happy seat," a "happy place," and a "happy ile"; the human pair is a "happy race" a "happy pair," each one a "happy creature" in a "happy state." The sheer number of appearances of the word makes "happy" and "Paradise" near equivalents; much more description is unnecessary when "happy" may be accepted as standing for the unknowable state of unfallen humanity.

"Bliss," as the intensified "happy," is applied most suitably to the state enjoyed in Heaven; "bliss" is sometimes the synonym for Heaven (as in II.85, where the devils are "driv'n out from bliss") or for God (when in VI.892 the Son sits at "the right hand of bliss"), but it often simply describes the condition of beings in Heaven. The word is not confined to the Heavenly sphere, however, appearing occasionally in the Paradisal scenes.

The importance of both "bliss" and "happy" is prepared for in the opening lines of the poem. The narrator imagines the time when "one greater man" will "Restore us, and regain the blissful seat" (I.4-5) directly after he has told of the advent of "all our woe" (3). And when he asks the first question of his Muse -- what caused our first parents' fall? -- he refers to their prelapsarian condition simply as "that happy state" (I.29). What follows in Books I and II is an account, not of the happiness of Adam and Eve, but of the "woe" of the devils, so that by the time the happy pair appear in Book IV -- after having been prepared for also by the foretelling of God in Book III -- their happiness has a clear contrast, one exaggerated by the presence of Satan in Book IV; as we see the couple, so does he through his "woeful" eyes.

What follows in the paradisal books is a close association between the place -- the physical state -- and the state of mind: Adam and Eve are "happy" in the garden. The fall separates the two, as we have seen in Satan; he is in the "happy place" but carries the woe of Hell with him. The internalizing of happiness is the final movement of the felix culpa, when in exile Adam and Eve must seek "a paradise within [them], happier far" (XII.587). The repetition of "woe," "happy," and, to a lesser extent "bliss," then, has two effects. It makes clear the opposition between the fallen and the unfallen and prepares for the paradox of the fortunate fall by internalizing what in Heaven and Paradise are externally imposed; and it represents simply what it is impossible to describe adequately: the way one feels in Paradise, in Heaven, or in Hell.

The most effective example of Milton's word patterns, though, is one that involves a whole spectrum of vegetative images, including "root," "tree," "flower," "fruit," and "seed." Each of these has its own function in the fabric of the poem. "Tree," for instance, is important exclusively in its association with the real "tree of the knowledge of good and evil," while "fruit" functions both in its association with one of the plot's central objects and in its metaphoric associations. "Seed" is almost wholly metaphoric, standing for Eve's projected progeny and specifically for the Christ. Despite the varying roles of these words in the poem, their connection one to the other as stages in the regenerative cycle of the tree both extends their unifying power and subtly insists on the providential structure that underlies the story of mankind's fall.

The word "root" is neither so prevalent as the other terms in the system, nor is its use as complex. The infrequency of its appearance means that the role it can play in the accumulation of sense, in the effect of "retrospection and anticipation," is limited to its bond with the other terms. It has three meanings. It refers to Adam and Eve as the "one root" that Satan will pervert (II.383). It refers in God's words to the Son:

> be thou in Adam's room
> The Head of all mankind, though Adam's son.
> As in him perish all men, so in thee
> As from a secondroot shall be restor'd. (III.285-88)

Here only Adam is that first root, and the typing of Adam and Christ as roots parallels the typing of Eve and the second Eve -- Mary -- as bearers of the "seed," a connection I will discuss later. That "root" is thirdly the tree itself, in this passage:

> So glister'd the dire Snake, and into fraud
> Led Eve our credulous Mother, to the Tree
> Of prohibition, root of all our woe. (IX.643-5)

The word play here is ironic: the object is both tree and root. The general nature of "roots," though, is expounded in Raphael's analogy of how mankind may gradually ascend to the status of angels:

> So from the root
> Springs lighter the green stalk, from thence the leaves
> More aery, last the bright consummate flow'r
> Spirits odorous breathes: flow'rs and thir fruit
> Man's nourishment, by gradual scale sublim'd
> To vital spirits aspire. (V.479-84)

The root, then, is the beginning, from which all else will spring. And the poem deals with three roots: the first root of mankind in Eve and especially Adam; the new start which the "second root" of Christ will give humanity; and the "root of all our woe," the tree whose taste created the need for the second root.

That "tree" appears far more often than does "root," but while "root" is almost always in the poem used metaphorically, "tree" is always literal. While it is often used to elaborate the plenitude of the garden, it also stands for the two trees in the garden which are specified: the tree of life and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Cleanth Brooks argues that Milton equates food and knowledge in the poem, expanding on the notion of a fruit whose taste may bring the knowledge of good and evil. And although he is right to say that there are a number of analogies made between eating and knowing, through the poem it is most often the tree itself, rather than the fruit, which is associated with that knowledge. In Book IV, for instance, Adam repeats the prohibition not to taste "that only Tree" (423): "God hath pronounc'd it death to taste that tree" (427). Satan overhears and notes that "One fatal Tree there stands of Knowledge call'd" (514). Raphael reminds Adam that he is "Charg'd not to touch the interdicted Tree" (VII.46) "of the Tree / Which tasted works knowledge of Good and Evil / Thou may'st not" (542). The tree itself, then, and not the fruit, is most often associated with the prohibition until the temptation scenes, when the beauty of the fruit becomes an issue.

The tree of knowledge is central to the story, and the number of references to other trees should recall that tree. But it is not the central tree in the garden: the tree of Life is. That tree has a peculiar function in the poem. It is never touched -- nor is there a prohibition against touch ing it -- but it is the only other tree in the garden which is specified. Remarkably, it is Satan who has the most to do with the tree. He surveys what happens in the garden in Book IV in the form of a cormorant from atop the "Tree of Life, / The middle Tree and highest there that grew" (194-5), and after he is caught in the garden and expelled, he re-enters through the fountain in the center of the garden "by the Tree of Life" (IX.73). Although that tree is not included in the prohibition, its proximity to the mortal tree recalls for us one of the fall's consequences: death. It is for the sake of bitter irony, then, that Milton has his Satan in both entrances to the garden come in by the tree of life, when Satan will himself bring death into the world.

Although "flower" fits chronologically in the life of a plant after "tree" and "root" and before "fruit," its use bears less directly on the nature and consequences of the fall than do any of the other stages in the regenerative cycle. Kathleen Swaim does a thorough job of tracing the prelapsarian status of flowers: flowers generally "describe the world of Adam and Eve" (156), where the rose is without thorn and flowers are sights and provide the scents that dominate the garden. She is particularly interested in the connection between flowers and Eve: Eve is the one to name the flowers, and her associations with Pomona and Flora strengthen the bond (160-61). Eve is among the flowers when she is approached by Satan, and when she returns, fallen, to Adam, the emblem of her fall is encapsulated in this image:

> From his slack hand the Garland wreath'd for Eve
> Down dropp'd, and all the faded Roses shed. (IX.892-93)

While Swaim goes on to show how the prevalence of flowers gives way to the importance of "fruit" in Book IX, she does not, I think, make the connection between Eve, the flowers, and the fall as strongly as she might. Adam's reaction to Eve's news suggests that Eve has been "deflowered" (Milton's own pun), but it also appeals to the cyclical nature of vegetation, in which flowers must fall in order to give way to fruit. The fruit in this case is first the "mortal taste" but that too gives way to the greater "seed." Flowers, then, perform largely a descriptive function, demonstrating in a comprehensible way the beauty of the garden, but in their association with Eve they take their place in the unfolding of the vegetative cycle as the plot unfolds.

"Fruit" in Paradise Lost is more prevalent than "root" and carries with it greater variety of meaning than "tree." It is the most powerful of the repeated vegetative images. Because of the narrator's invocation and the familiarity of the Genesis story, it is known from the beginning of the poem that mankind's calamity occurs when Adam and Eve eat forbidden fruit. The fruit itself functions as more than an incidental or arbitrary device of the plot. While Milton, bound as he was by his sacred source, could not alter the nature of the prohibition and crime, he was free to develop the role of that prohibited fruit, expanding its significance by connecting it to other parts of his epic: the devils' punishment, Adam's and Eve's daily life, and the consequences for mankind of the fall. Making use of three meanings of the word "fruit," Milton unites three of the poem's prime concerns: the object of the crime, its consequences, and its effect on the generations to follow. Since the word is often used in the epic with at least two of its meanings in play, it is an example of the decorous use to which Milton could put the word-play for which he has so often been blamed. As well, the word accumulates layers of significance in its appearances, so that even the most apparently innocent occurrence of the word should awaken echoes of the central fatal fruit; this accumulation is an example of how the poem's matter may be unified and clarified through simple repetition.

Although it is fair to say that no one would dispute the simple importance of fruit as an object in Paradise Lost, few critics have realized how far-reaching that importance is. Isabel MacCaffrey, in her general discussion on the use to which Milton puts repeated words, mentions the importance of the term, especially in connection with other key words that appear in the poem's opening lines:

> "Fruit" and "woe" are key words to which critical associations are attached in the course of the poem; they are also linked, syntactically and logically, to each other, since the woe of change and loss is one of the fruits of the forbidden tree. (83-4)

She goes no further with "fruit," however, choosing rather to expand on other repeated words. Kathleen Swaim picks up MacCaffrey's point, discussing the poem's vegetation as imagery and metaphor and focusing on the three related stages of "flower," "fruit," and "seed". Although her argument about Edenic flowers is complete and consistent, especially in her association of Eve with floral imagery, she overlooks the role "fruit" plays in the unfallen garden, choosing to restrict its role to the postlapsarian cosmos:

> The design includes the miniature reenactment of the whole central action of the poem within a single image briefly glimpsed . . . and ranges to include a rendering of the whole prelapsarian cosmos as flowers and the whole postlapsarian scheme of time and history as fruit. Man's prelapsarian relationship to deity is rendered florally as praise; the postlapsarian relationship fruitfully as prayer (156)

For her, imagery and flowers are prelapsarian; "Fruit and metaphor are postlapsarian categories," and the third -- the seed -- comes after both. The chronological focus of her argument, however, ignores the multiple meanings that "fruit" alone has both before and after the fall and the importance of fruit to unfallen life. Mankind is able to reach up to eat fruit in the state of innocence, but after the fall has fruit taken from it and is constrained to bend down to make bread from the fields. Frequently the metaphoric uses of "fruit" do appear after the fall or when God and the Son are discussing what is to come, but there are times too when unfallen characters are aware of the metaphoric meanings of the word because they draw attention to the difference between fruit real and metaphoric in puns. Eve's "Fruitless to me, though fruit be here to excess," and Raphael's comparison of the number of sons from Eve's "fruit-ful" womb to the many fruits which Adam and Eve have prepared for his dinner are two examples which will be discussed at greater length later. Generally, then, in Swaim's essay "fruit" suffers unfairly in the attempt to elevate prelapsarian flowers. She forgets, I think, that Milton went out of his way to show that in Eden fruits and flowers grow on the trees at the same time; the passage illustrates the lack of seasons as well as the coexistence of cause and effect.

The word "fruit" and its cognates ("fruits," "fruitful," "fruition," "fruitless," "fruit-trees") appear 91 times in Paradise Lost. They appear, not surprisingly, most frequently in Book IX -- it is in that Book that the debates between Satan and Eve and between Eve and Adam about the nature of the specifically forbidden fruit transpire -- and least frequently in Books I and II, where the devils engage in "fruitless" activities in a place where nothing will grow. In Book IX there are 29 occurrences of "fruit," 2 of "fruitless," and one of "fruits." Most often in this book -- 26 times out of 32 -- the reference is to the specific fruit of the forbidden tree, and most of these references appear during the serpent's debate with Eve and Eve's with Adam. It is towards this fruit and away from it that the narrative moves. The forbidden fruit takes on odd characteristics during the debates and after. Before Book IX, the Tree of Knowledge's fruit itself is seldom referred to or described, while other fruits are "ambrosial," "golden," "burnished with golden rind." The exception is in Eve's account of her dream, in which her companion calls the fruit "divine" and the tree"fair plant." There is a sensible explanation for the lack: the fruit should not appear obtrusively attractive, nor should it seem a preoccupation to unfallen mankind. Indeed, the one discussion of the tree by Adam and Eve, when we have first seen them in Book IV, seems somewhat out of place. There appears little reason for Adam's insistence that they "not think hard/ One easy prohibition" (IV.431-2); he appears to be protesting too much, and there are subtler ways in which Milton could make it clear that Adam and Eve are aware of the restriction. It is, of course, necessary that Satan overhear the means by which he can pervert mankind. Even after Eve's dream of eating the fruit in Book V the pair do not discuss the crime itself, but rather speculate on the problem of evil thought in the blameless mind. The avoidance of the subject of the fruit suggests that even the possibility of disobeying God is not in their minds.

In Book IX, however, the forbidden fruit gains adjectives: it becomes in Satan's speeches "fruit of fairest colours mixt,/ Ruddy and Gold" (577), "alluring" (588), "fair" (731), in Eve's unfallen speech "wondrous" (650), and "fair (661); when she begins to consider her crime, the fruit becomes " best of fruits" (745), "fair" (763), "Fruit Divine/ Fair to the Eye, inviting to the Taste" (776-7), and after she has eaten it is "fair" (798) and "fairest" (851); Adam before he eats calls it "sacred Fruit forbidd'n" (904), "sacred Fruit, Sacred to abstinence" (924). In the descriptions of the forbidden fruit itself, the progression of adjectives attached to it reveals what seems to be a change in its own moral status. The adjectives change not only through the story but with different characters. It is "Fair" to those who are tempted or to those who have tasted: evil appears good to the trangressor at the moment of choice. It is most often "sacred" or "forbidden" before the temptations, and "false" and "fallacious" after the fall (perhaps another pun in FALLacious). The fruit itself appears to carry the burden of guilt in its description, whereas it should surely be neutral. Adam and Eve are the only characters who eat the fruit, although Satan lies about eating it in the dream and in the guise of the snake. There are four similar descriptions of eating fruit -- "plucking and eating" -- in Adam's dream upon his creation, in Eve's dream, in Eve's fall, and in Adam's fall. If one believes, then, that in some way Eve's fall has been prepared for by her dream, so has Adam a similarly described preparation in his dream.

Except for occasional references and Eve's dream, the actual fruit of the forbidden tree plays only a small part until Book IX, but the abundance of fruit in the garden ensures that the object of temptation is never far from an attentive reader's mind. Each time "fruit" is mentioned, the central forbidden fruit is recalled. Often "fruit" will appear simply in a list meant to enumerate the good things of the earth: "on herb, tree, fruit and flow'r" (IV.644), "Plant, Fruit, Flow'r Ambrosial, Gems and Gold" (VI.475), or "of Taste, Sight, Smell, Herbs, Fruits and Flow'rs" (VIII.527). Such repeated lists help characterize the garden, as in the following example:

> And higher than that Wall a circling row
> Of goodliest Trees loaden with fairest Fruit,
> Blossoms and Fruits at once of golden hue
> Appear'd, with gay enamell'd colours mixt. (IV.146-9)

Here the state of the fruit-trees illustrates the unfallen garden's lack of seasons; blossoms and fruits, which in the fallen world are cause and effect, grow simultaneously. When a colour is ascribed to the fruit, either generally or to the prohibited fruit, it is usually golden, and from the colour, taken from the most perfect mineral, one can deduce the fruit's value and perfection. Indeed, in the absence of the importance of mineral wealth anywhere in the poem but in Hell, fruit becomes the most valuable prelapsarian natural possession, despite its low place in the hierarchy of creation.[11]

But fruit in the garden is more than just pleasant to the eye. Milton creates for Adam and Eve a domestic routine, one in which fruit provides both ready food and pleasant occupation. They are "fruitarians"; before the fall such fare is sufficient to satisfy "true appetite" (V.305). The food is readily available, and the lack of seasons makes storage unnecessary, as Eve explains to Adam:

> Adam, earth's hallow'd mould,
> Of God inspir'd, small store will serve, where store,

All seasons, ripe for use hangs on the stalk;
Save what by frugal storing firmness gains
To nourish, and superfluous moist consumes. (V.321-25)

The passage is interesting because, although it is surely meant to stress the ready bounty of paradisal fruits, it also suggests that Adam, who asks Eve to bring forth "what [her] stores contain" (314), is unaware of how he gets his daily fruit. Eve is clearly, then, more attuned to the nature of the garden, while Adam's thoughts may be occupied otherwise. There is also an early account of the ease with which they gather their food:

to thir Supper Fruits they fell,
Nectarine Fruits which the compliant boughs
Yielded them, side-long as they sat recline
On the soft downy Bank damaskt with flow'rs:
The savoury pulp they chew, and in the rind
Still as they thirsted scoop the brimming stream. (V.331-336)

How ecologically sound is paradisal life: not even the rind, used as a drinking cup, is wasted. And although their sole task is to tend the garden, they need not coax the garden to grow -- rather, they must check its over-abundance, where "any row/ Of Fruit-trees overwoody reach'd too far/ Thir pamper'd boughs, and needed hands to check/ Fruitless imbraces" (V.212-215).

Kathleen Swaim, in her article on vegetative imagery and metaphor in Paradise Lost, argues that the poem includes "a rendering of the whole prelapsarian cosmos as flowers and the whole postlapsarian scheme of time and history as fruit" (156). Although I concede the prominence of flowers in descriptions of the garden, prelapsarian fruit cannot be overlooked, and it is the very connection of prelapsarian fruit with the "fruits" of the fall that gives the stages greater continuity. The dependence of Adam and Eve on fruit for nourishment and occupation creates a reason for the form of the one prohibition. It is not an arbitrary choice of restriction, that is, but one consistent with unfallen domesticity. As well, the presence of so much permitted fruit in descriptions of Edenic life keeps alive the expectation of the forbidden fruit's appearance.

Fruit figures in punishment too, both of mankind and of the devils. After the fall, mankind suffers alteration both in the kind of food to be eaten and in the degree of difficulty by which it may be obtained. God's curse after the fall purposefully avoids a mention of postlapsarian fruit:

> Curs'd is the ground for thy sake, thou in sorrow
> Shalt eat thereof all the days of thy Life;
> Thorns also and Thistles it shall bring thee forth
> Unbid, and thou shalt eat th'Herb of the Field,
> In the sweat of thy Face shalt thou eat Bread,Till thou return unto the ground. (X.201-206)

While Milton lifts almost the entirety of God's curse from Genesis, the contrast this curse presents to the pleasant, easy work in Paradise makes the punishment seem more profound.

Milton invents his punishment of the devils, however. After mankind has been perverted, Satan returns to his followers whose applause becomes hissing as they become snakes. Their torment follows:

> There stood
> A Grove hard by, sprung up with this thir change,
> His will who reigns above, to aggravate
> Thir penance, laden with fair Fruit, like that
> Which grew in Paradise, the bait of Eve
> Us'd by the Tempter: on that prospect strange
> Thir earnest eyes they fix'd, imagining
> For one forbidden Tree a multitude
> Now ris'n, to work them furder woe or shame;
> Yet parcht with scalding thirst and hunger fierce,
> Though to delude them sent, could not abstain,

> But on they roll'd in heaps, and up the Trees
> Climbing, sat thicker than the snaky locks
> That curl'd Megaera: greedily they pluck'd
> The Fruitage fair to
> sight, like that which grew
> Near that bituminous Lake where Sodom flam'd;
> This more delusive, not the touch, but taste
> Deceiv'd; they fondly thinking to allay
> Thir appetite with gust, instead of Fruit
> Chew'd bitter Ashes, which th' offended taste
> With spattering noise rejected. (X.547-568)

Milton himself compares these fruits to the apples near Sodom, which were to have appeared perfect, but which in fact had been made ash to the core by the same fire that destroyed the city. The action also enacts the curse that the serpent "shall eat dust," as Alastair Fowler points out, and is in keeping with the traditional belief that serpents eat only dust.[12] What is most interesting about this scene, however, is that it acts as an emblem of what Satan has done to mankind: the fruit that he convinced Eve to eat brought mankind, as it brings the devils, to ashes and dust. The central fruit of the forbidden tree, then, echoes both in descriptions of unfallen life and in the nature of fallen punishment. Through their guile the fruit brought "Death into the world and all our woe" and caused man "to dust return" (X.208).

With the word "fruit" as metaphor, Milton finds another way to connect various parts of the poem to the forbidden fruit without referring directly to it. For instance, when God or the Son uses the word, it usually carries the secondary meaning of "result" or "product," as in Book III, when God forecasts the Paradise to come:

> Meanwhile
> The World shall burn, and from her ashes spring
> New Heav'n and Earth, wherein the just shall dwell
> And after all thir tribulations long

See golden days, fruitful of golden deeds,
With Joy and Love triumphing, and fair Truth. (III.333-8)

It is golden deeds, not golden fruit, that future golden days will produce. Actual fruit is replaced by fruit of a different kind, the results of human action on the new earth. A similar passage earlier in the book describes not the second Eden but the first:

On Earth he first beheld
Our two first Parents, yet the only two
Of mankind, in the happy Garden plac't,
Reaping immortal fruits of joy and love. (III.64-9)

These similar descriptions serve to parallel Paradise and the Paradise to come. "Fruits" and "fruitful" refer in both to results or products, and the choice of metaphor is appropriate, since a particular fruit will act as catalyst in what will come between these two places of joy and love.

The "immortal fruits" of the earlier passage will also be recalled in Eve's somewhat insensitive question in Book XI: "how shall we breathe in other Air / Less pure, accus tom'd to immortal Fruits?" (284-5). Both phrases contrast, one before the fact and one after, with the "mortal taste" of the fruit of the tree of knowledge. While in the narrator's description, the "fruits" are metaphoric -- the products of unfallen joy and love -- the fallen Eve is more literal: she laments the loss of the garden's odorous fruits.

The most significant use of "fruit" as metaphor for "product" or "result" comes in the Son's speech to the Father about repentance in Book XI:

See Father, what first fruits on Earth are sprung
From thy implanted Grace in Man, these Sighs
And Prayers, which in this Golden Censer, mixt
With Incense, I thy Priest before thee bring,
Fruits of more pleasing savor from thy seed
Sown with contrition in his heart, than those

Which his own hand manuring all the Trees
Of Paradise could have produc't, ere fall'n
From innocence. *(XI.22-30)*

Here the metaphoric fruits of prayer not only recall the central fruit of the forbidden tree, but also support the notion of the felix culpa; the fruits after the fall are, in the Son's own analogy, of "more pleasing savour" than the Paradisal literal fruits. Adam describes a similar if home lier phenomenon when he explains the principle of abundance in Paradise :

well may we afford
Our givers thir own gifts, and large bestow
From large bestow'd, where Nature multiplies
Her fertile growth, and by disburd'ning grows
More fruitful, which instructs us not to spare. (V.316-320)

In Paradise, the loss of fruit will make the trees yet more fruitful; the more fruit that is taken, the more will appear. The felix culpa, then, receives the benefit of horticultural analogy. The Son's analogy also follows the general movement of the poem from external to internal, from Paradise to the "Paradise within thee, happier far," and it illustrates the primacy of grace over works -- man's own hand can produce only real fruit, but with God's seed can be sown the fruit of prayer. Here again Adam's speech parallels the Son's, as he too attributes all the fruit to God alone.

Raphael makes an analogy even more like the Son's, connecting metaphoric fruits to the real ones of the garden, when he greets Eve:

Hail Mother of Mankind, whose fruitful Womb
Shall fill the World more numerous with thy Sons
Than with these various fruits the Trees of God
Have heap'd this Table. (V.388-91)

His greeting recalls -- or one might say anticipates -- Gabriel's and later Elizabeth's greetings to Mary in Luke I:

> 28. And the angel came in unto her and said, Hail, thou that art highly favoured, The Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women.

And:

> 42. Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb.

The narrator himself makes the connection clearer -- Milton here goes out of his way to ensure that the association of the two women is not missed -- by introducing Raphael's greeting:

> On whom the Angel Hail
> Bestow'd, the holy salutation us'd
> Long after to blest Mary, second Eve. (V.385-7)

For both women, the greetings prophesy momentous progeny, in Eve's case all mankind and, in Mary's, mankind's saviour. The "fruitful womb" of Eve associates her with the "second Eve," so even before the fall the reader may have the sense of what good may come of evil. Mother Mary Pecheux, in her essay "The Concept of the Second Eve in Paradise Lost," emphasizes the ironic contrasts between the two figures. Although through Mary comes life, through her prototype comes death. Their positions in the two events are parallel; mankind does not fall when Eve does, nor is mankind saved by Mary. In both cases the women act as channels through which the first Adam is seduced and the second Adam is born. The image of the fruit of the womb, which here is the major connection between the two women, is also important, because it prepares for the major vegetative image of the last two books, Eve's "seed" through which mankind will be redeemed.

But the reference to fruit also places Eve in the con text of her "fruitful" surroundings. Raphael's analogy, like the Son's, states that the "fruit" which will come after, in this case the rest of mankind, will exceed the present fruit of the garden. While the Son's analogy showed that the fruits of prayer were of greater worth than the fruits of the garden, Raphael chooses the fruits of the garden only for their vast numbers. Mother Pecheux identifies the irony

> in the comparison with the fruits heaped on the table from the trees of God, for it is through the fruit of the one forbidden tree that Eve is to lose her blessedness. The whole passage points forward to the temptation scene. (361)

Both the analogy of the son and of the angel, though, choose that local, domestic image, which is already associated with the fall, to help explain the prayer that comes immediately after and the generations of mankind that are the further "fruits" of the fall. "Fruit," then, comes to mean not only a general result or product, but also the specific production of offspring, that is, reproduction.

Both of these secondary meanings of "fruit" appear repeatedly. One of the poem's most often noted puns, for instance, is Eve's on seeing the tree of knowledge: "Serpent, we might have spar'd our coming hither, / Fruitless to me, though Fruit be here to excess" (IX.647-50).[13] Indeed, Eve's repetition of "fruit" shows her awareness of word-play, and perhaps even of unfallen metaphor, but even in that simple pun there lurks a meaning accessible only to the narrator and his reader; her coming hither should have been "fruitless" -- without fruit and without consequence -- but after some discussion with Satan she eats the one and incurs the other. This same pun on "fruitless" is repeated at the end of the book, with even more irony than it invited before the fall. The first pleasant effects of the fruit have worn off, and Adam and Eve are suffering a forbidden-fruit hang over:

> Thus they in mutual accusation spent
> The fruitless hours, but neither self-condemning,
> And of thir vain contest appear'd no end. (IX.1187-89)

The irony here is the narrator's alone; fruit paradoxically causes fruitlessness.

These ironies are complemented by another. God in Book III, when projecting the effects of the fall and receiving the promise from the Son of sacrifice, praises him

> Because thou hast, though Thron'd in highest bliss
> Equal to God, and equally enjoying
> God-like fruition, quitted all to save
> A world from utter loss. (III.305-308)

Fowler's note at this point suggests that "the oddness of diction signals a punning allusion to Adam's contrasting behaviour" (160). Because Adam and Eve would not forego the forbidden fruit, the Son must, in God's words, forego "God- like fruition" (III.307). And further, as the Son's choice will make him man, so man's choice -- he thought -- would make him as God. It is interesting that the word "fruition" here is a true pun and not a horticultural metaphor; although the word is erroneously now associated with "fruit," it really just shares the same root, and means "enjoyment" or"possession." Milton would not have made the philological error, but would have been aware of the similar root as well as the similar sound, and so the connection between the actual fruit of the forbidden tree and its results is maintained.

Since so often in the repetition of key words those words recall meanings other than the immediately accessible one, a word about Milton's punning is in order. Word-play has not gone unnoticed in Paradise Lost -- witness Edward LeCompte's Dictionary of Puns in Milton's English Poetry (1981) -- and neither has it gone uncensured. Samuel Johnson reprimands this tendency along with other literary sins:

> His plays on words, in which he delights too often; his equivocations, which Bentley endeavours to defend by the example of the ancients; his unnecessary and ungraceful use of terms of art, it is not necessary to mention, because they are easily remarked and generally censured, and at last bear so little proportion to the whole that they scarcely deserve the attention of the critic. (713)

Landor, in one of his imaginary conversations, determined that the first sin of the bad angels was punning: they fell quickly after so doing. Most often the objection to punning is one of decorum. Such a low form of humour, the argument goes, does not belong in the most elevated of literary forms. Milton's word-play has its defenders, however, most notably in Christopher Ricks, who distinguishes, with Empson and Raleigh before him, between puns in which the two words are etymologically related and those in which the two words are unrelated, the latter being the less palatable of the two. Raleigh argues that "it seems likely that [Milton] believed in an etymological relation between the two words, and so fancied that he was drawing attention to an original unity of meaning" (211). The connection between two words, then, was not for a joke alone; their similarity was to reveal a truth hidden in the changes to the word through the evolution of language. Certainly the word-play on "fruit" is decorous, since all three meanings have the same root.

"Fruit" means offspring elsewhere too, though not again as significantly as in Raphael's address to Eve. In the narrator's praise of unfallen sexuality, for example, he contrasts it with "the bought smile / Of Harlots, loveless, joyless, unindear'd, / Casual fruition" (IV.765-67). The pun on "fruition" in a sexual context suggests the irony of "fruition" -- enjoyment -- without "fruit" or offspring. To prevent a similar, but vegetative, fruitlessness is the daily task of unfallen Adam and Eve:

> On to thir morning's rural work they haste
> Among sweet dews and flow'rs; where any row
> Of Fruit-trees overwoody reach'd too far
> Thir pamper'd boughs, and needed hands to check
> Fruitless imbraces. (V.211-15)

What follows is an extended description of the "marriage" of elm and vine that connects even more clearly proper vegetable and human sexuality. The unchecked embraces of the fruit- trees would be without beneficial results, and, in the context of the sexual metaphors, yield no offspring, while literally yielding no fruit. Adam and Eve's tending of the fruit-trees, then, provides a reflection of their own proper sexual relationship. Swaim calls the passage:

> lovely and traditional, but strictly speaking the image is botanically unsound. Wedding and fertility diction is valid only as a metaphor for human love, process, and fruitfulness. Fruit and metaphor are postlapsarian categories. Critics have regularly observed that the similes or explicit comparisons in Paradise Lost interrelate prelapsarian and postlapsarian dimensions; it has not I think been noticed before that the implicit comparisons of metaphor in the poem also depend on the postlapsarian. The lines just cited invite a comparison between "fruit" as image and "fruit" as metaphor, a distinction fully elaborated in the last third of the poem. "Fruit" as image (or prelapsarian fruit) encompasses the edibles supplied by the Edenic orchard, rendered with the wonderful sensuousness, harmony, and joy of the present passage; "fruit" as metaphor requires interpretation in relation to human and fallen possibilities, fruitfulness through love, process, and time. (159)

Surely in the narrator's passage there is metaphor without the fall. The behavior of the plants which Adam and Eve must tend provides a reflection of the proper state of their own relationship, in terms both of hierarchy and of sexuality. What unfallen humans arrive at naturally they must guide the fruit-trees and the vines to. Whether this should be the state of affairs in the unfallen natural world is not at issue. Milton chose to have his pair occupied with such cultivation, and to impress upon their surroundings the image of their relationship. That relationship is meant to be fruitful too; in creation the multiplication of species is demanded of all creatures and is not merely a consequence of the fall. Neither is progress, as Swaim suggests, because Raphael suggests the means by which gradually mankind may "at last turn all to spirit, / Improv'd by tract of time" (V.497- 8).

"Fruitfulness through love, process and time," then, are not strictly postlapsarian categories, though their unfolding in the unfallen world is prevented by the fall.

That "fruit" or its cognates carries three meanings in *Paradise Lost* is not surprising. The actual fruit, the consequences of the eating of that fruit, and the effect of the fall on the fruit of Eve's womb are all central to the epic's theme, and are united in the poem from its first lines. There we have the "fruit / Of that forbidden tree," the consequences of eating that fruit -- death and all our woe -- and, in the "our," the reference to the fruit of Eve's womb: the poem has particular meaning to us because we are the inheritors of the consequences of the fall. Just as they are united in these lines, crime, consequences, and all mankind are united in the word "fruit." The repetition of the word, then, has not only the effect of associating the unfallen fruitfulness of Eden with the forbidden fruit; it also connects those real fruits to the fall's consequences. The effect is domestic as well as unifying, making all of unfallen life simply and singly connected. Everything imporant in the poem -- the prohibition, the consequences, the continuation of the species, the "one greater man," the punishment of the devils -- is connected to the everyday life of Adam and Eve, their tending and eating of the fruit of the garden. The word is capable, then, albeit in a small way, of uniting the time before the fall, the moment of the fall, the fall's immediate consequences, and the rest of human history.

A. Bartlett Giamatti argues in *The Earthy Paradise and the Renaissance Epic* that in all the garden's images we are meant to think of the potential for evil:

> The point I am making is the same one made pre viously, that by suggestions, allusions, and the subtle interweaving of old enchanted garden themes, Milton prepares us for the Fall by making us suspect,

> by making us ask again and again: Will this garden too prove false? Will the inhabitants meet the same fate as past couples? Finally, does this garden only appear harmonious and beautiful and innocent? (312)

Giamatti is here discussing the relationship between this garden's qualities and those of past epics and romances, and indeed, just as Milton gives his garden depth by connections within his own epic, he adds the depth of context by allusion to the paradisal tradition. The difference between a reader of Milton's garden, however, and a reader of Spenser's or Tasso's is that the events which will occur in Milton's garden are well known far in advance. We expect rather than suspect. So the combination of references to other gardens which were not as they seemed and multiple references to "fruit" combine to connect the whole of the poem to the central prohibition.

While "fruit" is the most fully worked out of the poem's vegetative images, it is not the one on which the poem ends. "Fruit" plays a part, as I have said, in unfallen life, in the description of the garden, in the punishments of mankind and the devils, in the immediate results of the fall, and in the early references to fertility, both human and vegetable. But it relinquishes its role as the most powerful image in the last books, where the emphasis shifts to the "seed" of God's curse. The change is appropriate. Not only is it the word that the Bible uses in the curse, but it also provides some separation between that which caused the fall and that which will repair that fall's ruins. "Seed" belongs to the same category of imagery as "fruit," but the latter's strong associations with sin and pain make a second, if related, image a better choice for the future.

"Seed," like "fruit" and "tree," is a key word whose introduction comes in the poem's opening lines -- the narrator refers to "that Shepherd, who first taught the chosen Seed" -- but unlike the other terms, like "tree," "fruit," or "woe," "seed" plays but a small part in the greater part of the poem. It cannot therefore be said to unify of itself the poem, nor to cause the "reminiscences" which Isabel MacCaffrey attributes to the other terms. Indeed, before God's curse in Book X, the word appears only three times, once in those opening lines, again in Book III when God foresees the Son's fleshly birth "of virgin seed" (284), and again in the account of creation in Book VII, when Raphael quotes the Bible's line about the fruit "whose seed is in her self upon the ground" (312). That second occurrence looks forward, past the events of the fall, and it will be repeated in the last books. The third example, one mentioned before, unites "fruit" and "seed," making it clear that, even in the early stages, what contains the potential for evil contains the potential for good. God is constantly reiterating that his is the power to make good of evil, and with that early symbol of the seed within the fruit his ability to do so appears.

"Seed" does function differently as a key word in the poem, but not only because it is unimportant until the last three books. In the repetition of "fruit," nature, the narrator, the prohibition, Eve, the punishments, and the metaphoric values of the word all worked, almost separately, toward the goal of unity. The importance of "seed," however, comes solely from God's "mysterious terms" in his curse on the serpent:

> Between Thee and the Woman I will put
> Enmity, and between thine and her Seed;
> Her Seed shall bruise thy head, thou bruise his heel. (X.179-81)

Most of the rest of the poem, then, will be a gradual education of both the humans and the devils about what "seed" means.

Satan is fairly well pleased with his lot, literal-minded as he is, when he reports his sentence to his fellows:

> that which to mee belongs
> Is enmity, which he will put between
> Mee and Mankind; I am to bruise his heel;

His Seed, when is not set, shall bruise my head:
A World who would not purchase with a bruise,
Or much more grievous pain? (X.496-501)

He recognizes the first meaning of "seed" -- Eve's children -- but expects a literal bruise, and only one. That his understanding of the curse is incomplete is shown by the immediate response of the other devils, the hissing and ashen fruit-eating to which God reduces them, but the depth of his misunderstanding is not made clear to him. This is the last that is seen of the devils.

Adam and Eve, however, are permitted to understand further. They get some way towards truth on their own. Discussing possible ways to avoid the punishment their sins will bring to their children, they suggest the possibilities of suicide and childlessness, but Adam dismisses both as insufficient:

Then let us seek
Some safer resolution, which methinks
I have in view, calling to mind with heed
Part of our Sentence, that thy Seed shall bruise
The Serpent's head; piteous amends, unless
Be meant, whom I conjecture, our grand Foe
Satan, who in the Serpent hath contriv'd
Against us this deceit: to crush his head
Would be revenge indeed; which will be lost
By death brought on ourselves, or childless days
Resolv'd, as thou proposest. (X.1028-38)

They, like Satan, are able to distinguish between the curse on the serpent and on the Devil, but they too believe the bruise to be a literal one, and imagine a crushed head as fit retribution for seducing mankind. Adam's ability to reason has not so far left him that he is not able to get further, as he explains to Eve:

peace return'd
Home to my Breast, and to my memory
His promise, that thy Seed shall bruise our Foe;

> Which then not minded in dismay, yet now
> Assures me that the bitterness of death
> Is past, and we shall live. (XI.153-8)

He has not quite got it right, but he is recalling the serpent's curse now as an assurance to mankind.

While God sends the tormenting fruit-tree to disabuse the devils in part, he sends Michael to disabuse Adam wholly, commanding him to

> reveal
> To Adam what shall come in future days,
> As I shall thee enlighten, intermix
> My Cov'nant in the woman's seed renew'd;
> So send them forth, though sorrowing, yet in peace. (XI.113-17)

The words of that first curse return again and again in the description of things to come in Book XI, but especially in Michael's words in Book XII. Michael says of Abraham that "in his Seed / All Nations shall be blest" (XII.125-6). He becomes more specific in telling of Abraham's sons:

> This ponder, that all Nations of the Earth
> Shall in his Seed be blessed; by that Seed
> Is meant thy great deliverer, who shall bruise
> The Serpent's head; whereof to thee anon
> Plainlier shall be reveal'd. (XII.147-51)

Michael is here repeating himself, but he does identify the "seed" more precisely than before, and makes clear that yet more specificity is to come. Again in the recounting of Moses' part, the archangel describes what Moses brought to the Israelites from God:

> part such as appertain
> To civil Justice, part religious Rites
> Of sacrifice, informing them, by types
> And shadows, of that destin'd Seed to bruise
> The Serpent, by what means he shall achieve
> Mankind's deliverance. (XII.230-35)

Finally Michael brings Adam to the story of David, and tells how of that "royal stock shall rise / A Son, the Woman's Seed to thee foretold . . . of Kings / the last" (XII.325-30). Each time, the seed progresses further from the general seed of mankind to the specific seed of Christ.

Adam understands gradually, and often interrupts Michael with a repetition of the major statements just revealed. To the news of Noah's covenant he responds: "I revive / At this last sight, assur'd that Man shall live / With all the Creatures, and thir seed preserve" (XI.871-3). He has come a long way from contemplation of suicide, and is now concerned that his line be continued. He praises what Michael has said about "Just Abraham and his Seed" (XII.273), and shows that he begins to perceive the specific application of "seed" after the prophesy of Christ's birth:

> now clear I understand
> What oft my steadiest thoughts have searcht in vain,
> Why our greatest expectation should be call'd
> The seed of Woman. (XII.376-79)

Adam still must be taught, however, the nature of the "battle" between Satan and the saviour:

> thee, who comes thy Saviour, shall recure,
> Not by destroying Satan, but his works
> In thee and in thy Seed. (XII.393-5)

Adam learns that this conclusion, like so much of fallen life, will involve a movement inward. But there are more examples of "seed" in Michael's speech. He concludes his relation of Christ's suffering and resurrection thus:

> from that day
> Not only to the Sons of Abraham's Loins
> Salvation shall be Preacht, but to the Sons
> Of Abraham's Faith wherever through the world;
> So in his seed all Nations shall be blest. (XII.446-50)

Adam has gradually been led to a fuller understanding of the meaning of the "seed": "The Woman's seed, obscurely then foretold, / Now amplier known thy Saviour and thy Lord" *(XII.543-5)*. That there is a hierarchy of permitted knowledge even within the human pair is clear from Michael's words to Adam about what to tell the sleeping Eve:

> thou at a season fit
> Let her with thee partake what thou hast heard,
> Chiefly what may concern her Faith to know,
> The great deliverance by her Seed to come
> (For by the Woman's Seed) on all Mankind. (XII.597-601)

Satan will understand least of the three what is meant by the seed, Eve somewhat more -- she is comforted, realizing that by her "the Promis'd Seed shall all restore" (XII.623) -- and Adam the most fully.

These last books, then, show not only a reliance on the term "seed" as an assurance of eventual salvation, and not only a gradual working-out of what that "seed" means, from the literal meaning, to the children of Adam and Eve, to the children of Abraham, to Christ, but also a method, much like Milton's own, used by an archangel. Michael, after God's recommendation, intermixes his speech to Adam with references to the "seed" which appeared most significantly in the Son's words. One passage, then, is recalled over and over, with an emphasis on the seed as a positive image to overshadow the "fruit" of earlier books. What the narrator does with "fruit," then, Michael does with "seed" in the books in which he is the primary speaker.

The emphasis on "seed" at the poem's end does, as Swaim writes, suggest a "potentiality for growth" (171). It is indeed a positive last term in a decidedly positive cycle of imagery. The prominence of roots, trees, flowers, fruit, and seeds imposes on the poem the regenerative life cycle. It does a great deal for the support of the doctrine of the "fortunate fall." On the one hand the beginning of the seasonal vegetative cycle marks the end of Eden's perfection: remember the earlier emphases on the seasonlessness of the garden -- the fruit and flowers growing simultaneously, the needlessness of storage, the perfect temperature. But that same cycle is for Milton's fallen readers one of the most powerful symbols of regeneration and rebirth. So while, on the one hand, Earth will never again see fruit and flowers on the same tree, it may, on the other hand now look forward to the greater seeds.

While we have seen the variety of uses Milton has found for the vegetative imagery in his poem -- how such words create a pattern of associations and recollections, and how the pattern as a whole emphasizes the regenerative workings of Providence rather than the destructive machinations of Satan -- there is another, perhaps more practical, reason for the abundance of such imagery. In the narrator's descriptions of places and people, he has access to a wide variety of analogies from thousands of years of human history after mankind's fall -- analogies including the classical, oriental, medieval, topical, mineral, and technical. Adam and Eve have not, perhaps by definition of their innocence, such access; their language must be drawn from what they know, and what they know is the garden. God, the Son, and the angels have a greater perspective both on time and on the universe, and so their language ranges further, but in their dealings with Adam and Eve and in their discussion of the problems of the garden, it is most appropriate that they too use models of language drawn from the garden. Placing innocent humanity, the fall, and the rest of human history in vegetative terms, then, connects all to that natural garden, not only so that Adam and Eve might understand, but also so that the relationship between this time and the paradisal garden could be understood. All is contained, through these references, within the _hortus conclusus_, which eventually becomes an internal garden, with the fruits, roots, and seeds lying within rather than without.

These instances of repeated words and phrases are included under the umbrella of "parallelism" because they work in the poem in a similar if less obtrusive way to the other parallels. A series of appearances by one word may have the same effect as the similar description of two different events: the one occurrence will carry its significance to the second, connecting the two. It is especially in the repetition of words such as "fruit" and "light," words which carry in the poem varying meanings, that the reader may become most aware of the connections.

This study has attempted not to determine the character of the verse as a whole, but rather to draw attention to one aspect of it: the simple repetition of key passages through which Milton is able to accumulate meaning.[14] What Milton's repetition of significant words whether single words, words grouped by oppositions, or words grouped by membership in a larger class of terms -- does in his poem is to allow the introduction of clusters of associations at important points in the narrative, to impose upon one moment the recollection of other moments. This function unifies as well as clarifies, connecting all points in the poem while it elucidates the nature of those connections. It serves as a model in little for the yet more complicated patterns of associations that support the poem's characters and their actions, patterns which are the subject of the next chapter.

Notes

[1] Isabel MacCaffrey makes a point about the diction of Paradise Lost and its relation to the structure of the whole poem:

> Every incident, every speech, almost every phrase of Paradise Lost casts light back and ahead to illuminate past and future so that we are made aware of the entire myth at once. The relatively small vocabulary used in the poem means that there is necessarily a high frequency of repeated words and phrases which gather significance as they go along and reinforce, even when they borrow strength from, our familiarity with the story. (87)

[2] The objection many be raised that the appearance of a few words of phrases over and over again is more the product of a habit of Milton's mind than a careful seeding of the verse with hints and associations. Milton's blindness during the composition of the poem has occasionally been cited as a cause of come of Paradise Lost's flaws -- Eliot calls the handicap "the most important fact about Milton, for my purpose" ("A Note on the Verse of John Milton") -- and perhaps it will be suggested that blindness caused the repetition: Milton did not notice that he was repeating himself. In the case of a "tendency" which appears most clearly a virtue rather than a flaw in the poem, it is perhaps advisable to give the poet the benefit of the doubt, to assume that the repetition is his doing.

[3] All three of these symbols will appear after their crime to make clear how far they have fallen: in place of modest sex there is lascivious, in place of the joined hands is Adam's seizing hand, and in place of their blameless nakedness is clothing.

[4] For a further discussion of the relationship between the human pair and their garden, see my discussion of the vegetative imagery in the poem later in this chapter.

[5] John Halkett writes that "[a]s the matrimonial writers advise, the affection which proceeds from their singleness gains Eve's obedience to Adam; he seizes Eve with 'gen tle hand,' and Eve yields" (p.107).

[6] The patterns in which "woe" appears are interesting in themselves: we have "all our woe" (three times),"all this woe"; "pain and woe," "woe and pain" (twice), "woe and sorrow," "woe and shame" (twice); "weal or woe" (twice), "bliss or woe" (twice); "world of woe," "signs of woe," "house of woe," "sights of woe," "share of woe"; "our beginning woe," "utter woe," "more woe" (twice), "certain woe," "long woes," "lasting woes," "endless woes," and "eternal woe" (twice). The repetition of certain kinds of phrases containing "woe" is another way of drawing attention to the recurrence.

[7] He also knows of what he speaks, though he may not realize that the human pair's happiness, although much more pleasant than what the fallen angel is now experiencing, is not so great as the joy in heaven he has lost, and so neither will angelic woe be as great as human.

[8] Again, as in Satan's earlier speech, it should be noticed that the woes of the Devils are multiplied appropriately, given their higher status before their fall, so rather than the single tree that worked woe on the humans, they are given an orchard. Perhaps the lesson from all this is the (modified) proverb: the higher they sit, the further they fall.

[9] It is remarkable that both Adam and Milton do not here play up the obvious pun on "woe" and "woman," since he in Book IX cannot resist the "Eve" and "evil" pun.

[10] I have conflated "happy" and "happie," ascribing little importance to Milton's orthography.

[11] There is, of course, some appropriate irony here; gold in Book I is described by the narrator as "precious bane." And indeed, this is what the beautiful fruit proves to be.

[12] John Steadman provides an interesting gloss on the passage in "Tantalus and the Dead Sea Apples": "In Milton's Hell the apples of the Tantalus myth are cross-grafted with those of the dead sea and the tree of knowledge."

[13] Christopher Ricks observes that the more obvious play on "fruitless" is Eve's, but that the narrator has his own in "excess."

[14] Isabel MacCaffrey explains the effect a mythic subject will have on the style in which it should be recounted:

> Milton's effects depend partly on repetition and variation, which at once cut down on the breadth of his vocabulary, since the structurally repetitive form of a mythological poem must be carried, in part, by a system of verbal reminiscence. (94)

She argues that a poem of exaggerated elevation cannot bear an equally exaggerated breadth or variety, but must comple ment height with simplicity of diction. Milton's poem has that "simplicity." From a statistical standpoint, the diction of Paradise Lost varies far less than a comparable section of Shakespeare's work (see Jesperson 12) and even without a concordance one may recognize that some simple words appear over and over, words such as "good," "evil," "happy," "woe," "light," and "dark." The prevalence of such simple, Saxon words as signifiers of central objects and ideas goes some way to dismiss accusations of Milton's Latinism.

Chapter IV

The Paralleling of Characters and Events: Biblical Typology and Hierarchical Images

Many of the most interesting parallels in Paradise Lost involve characters connected to one another by their places in the hierarchy that leads from inanimate objects to God. Some of these characters are in fact images of one another: Eve is the image of Adam as Adam is the image of God. But this is not the only chain of existence in the poem. There exists also the linear movement of the last two books from the first parents to Christ. The two are connected. While after the fall Adam and Eve must look forward to Christ and must come to recognize their places in the linear history that leads to the redemption, before the fall they look up to God and understand their place in that hierarchy through their relationships with other creatures in the line.

For some of these parallels, Milton has a model in one school of scriptural exegesis in the seventeenth-century, a school whose members read Old Testament characters, events, and objects as "types" of New Testament ones. Milton exploits this well-known technique of Biblical exegesis, inviting his reader to understand the epic in part by means of that technique, and in doing so imitates the means God used to write the scriptures. Just as Old Testament characters are not fully understood without reference to the New Testament, Milton's characters are not to be understood in isolation from each other.

Typology, simply put, is a method of interpreting Old Testament characters and events as prefigurations of characters and events in the New Testament; it is, in Erich Auer bach's words "the interpretation of one worldly event through another; the first signifies the second and the second fulfills the first."[1] The significance of the type -- whether it be a character like Moses, an event like the flight from Egypt, or an object like Moses' staff -- cannot be wholly grasped until the antitype is known, so neither the Old Testament's human authors nor its actors are aware of their function in the preparation for the Messiah. Such knowledge is possible only after Christ. A relationship between type and antitype will not be one of identity, but rather will involve subtle differences as well as likenesses, and a true type cannot be merely a symbol, abstraction, or myth; it must be a person, event, or object with historical reality.[2] Typology did not look forward only to the coming of Christ, however. People and events in the Old Testament could also prefigure the church and the life of the individual Christian or the events at the end of the world. For example, Aaron's priesthood is a type of priesthood in the Christian church, and the flood prefigures the eventual destruction of the world by fire.

Aquinas' divisions between the various methods of reading, as summarized by Madsen, are helpful:

Literal sense
A. Proper
B. Improper or figurative
1. Typical (the individual represents the universal)

2. Parabolic or allegorical (in the grammatical sense

3. Moral (as in animal fables)

Spiritual or allegorical sense

A. Allegorical or typical (to be distinguished from B- 1 above), where the Old prefigures the New Testament

B. Tropological or moral

C. Anagogical (relating to "eternal glory") (21)[3]

Aquinas places on the literal level the signification of the words used by the human author, including devices such as metaphor and allegory; the spiritual senses then depend on that first sense (Madsen 21-2). There are two sorts of spiritual sense: those invented by mankind and those placed in scripture by God. The former is acceptable and may be used for homiletic purposes as long as the interpretation leads to piety and not away from it (Madsen 24).

A connection between Old and New Testament through typology begins with the New Testament writers. Matthew, for example, describes the holy family's flight from Egypt while recalling the earlier flight of Moses and the Israelites:

> When he arose he took the young child and his mother by night, and departed into Egypt: And was there until the death of Herod : that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the Prophet, saying, Out of Egypt I have called my son. (Matt. 2:14-16)[4]

Christ refers to himself in John's account as the fulfillment of biblical promise:

> And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. (3:14-15)

Much of the impetus for figural interpretation of scriptures, however, comes from Saint Paul. He gave the "Old Testament" its name, and he sees its function as an introduction of the Gospel to the Church[5]:

> But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. (Gal. 3:23-4)

Paul uses typology to show the "universal significance of Christ's redemption and the permanence of his Church" (Gop pelt 151). The Pauline epistles, then, made the Old Testament a shadow of the New, through which the full significance of the New Testament could be grasped. The Old Testament lost its significance as history and became in Christianity a context for the history of Christ. As a result, even those with no stake in Jewish history itself could value the Old Testament (Auerbach 53).

In the centuries that followed, two main exegetical schools contested for supremacy. On the one hand, the Alexandrian Christians, the most notable of whom was Origen, contrived complicated allegorical methods of interpretation. Based on the allegorical readings of Jewish scripture by Philo of Alexandria, this school rejected the literal meaning of scripture as unimportant compared to its "hidden" meanings:[6] Moses, for instance, becomes the personification of intelligence and Noah of righteousness (Davis 15). Origen used similar methods for both Testaments, and it was against his threefold method that Chrysostom, Saint Basil, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Eusebius established their "school" at Antioch which concentrated on the literal and spiritual meanings of scripture rather than on the allegorical.[7] Auebach describes the difference in origin and effect of allegorical and typological exegesis:

> There is something scholarly, indirect, even abstruse about it [the fourfold method of exegesis], except on the rare occasions when a gifted mystic breathes force into it. By its origin and nature, it was limited to a relatively small circle of intellectuals and initiates; they alone could find pleasure and nourishment in it. Figural phenomenal prophesy, however, had

> grown out of a definite historical situation, the Christian break with Judaism and the Christian mission among the Gentiles; it had a historical function. (55-6)

The Reformers far preferred typological to allegorical exegesis. Luther wrote in Table Talk that as a young man he was so involved in multiple meanings that he would even allegorize a chamber pot.[8] Reform meant the recovery of scriptural truth by abandoning all but the literal level: one place was limited to one sense. That one sense could not be purely literal, however. Had not Paul and the Gospel writers themselves insisted on additional meanings for some scriptural passages, and had not they themselves used allegory and other such devices to make their points? These other senses, then, had to be incorporated into the literal.[9] Thus the reformers developed a two-fold reading of scripture, in which both levels are literal.[10] Handbooks of figures appeared in the fifteenth century, written by such men as Samuel Mather, Henry Vertue, Thomas Taylor, William Guild, and Benjamin Keach (Lewalski 1977 123). It became one of the two ways by which the Old and the New Testament could be connected, biblical prophecy the other (Madsen 43).

That Milton was aware of typological exegesis is clear from De Doctrina Christiana, in which he discusses the nature of the compound sense[11]:

> No Passage of scripture is to be interpreted in more than one sense; in the Old Testament, however, this sense is sometimes a compound of the historical and typical. (I.xxx)[12]

In "The Reason of Church Government," Milton makes clear how he relates Old Testament prophecy, not only to the life of Christ, but also to the life of the church and the individual Christian within it:

> In the prophecy of Ezekiel, from the 40th chapter onward, after the destruction of the temple, God, by his prophet, seeking to wean the hearts of the Jews from their old law, to expect a new and more perfect

> reformation under Christ, sets out before their eyes the stately fabric and constitution of his church, with all the ecclesiastical functions appertaining. (Chapter II)[13]

He goes on to write that that Old Testament temple is to be matched, not by a similar structure under the New Dispensation, but by the Christian's individual soul:

> Is not a far more perfect work, more agreeable to his perfection in the most perfect state of the church militant, the new alliance of God to man? Should not he rather now by his own prescribed discipline have cast his line and level upon the soul of man, which is his rational temple, and by the divine square and compass thereof form and regenerate in us the lovely shapes of virtues and graces, the sooner to edify and accomplish that immortal stature of Christ's body, which is his church, in all her glorious lineaments and proportions? (II)

Here Milton applies Vitruvius' notion of the Hominum ad Quadratum, in which the perfect proportions used in Renaissance architecture are thought to come from the perfect proportions with which God formed mankind. Rudolf Wittkower writes in Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism:

> As a proof of the harmony and perfection of the human body [Vitruvius] described how a well-built man fits with extended hands and feet exactly into the most perfect geometrical figures, the circle and the square. This simple picture seemed to reveal a deep and fundamental truth about man and the world, and its importance for Renaissance architects can hardly be overestimated (13).

Milton, however, reverses the idea. While in Vitruvius' plan architecture follows the primary perfection of the human body, the latter preceding the former, in Milton's plan of history the human production, the building, comes first under the old law, and the body fulfills the promise of the temple.

The transition from discussions of typology in the two Testaments to typology in imaginative literature is not without dangers. The problem is this: in order for there to be a true typological relationship, both type and antitype must be historical, real in time. The creator or "author" of the arrangement is God alone. A poet's attempt to imitate the technique God used in constructing time and in ordering the writing of scripture will be just that – an imitation of scriptural procedure, not scripture itself, and an imitation of typology, not typology itself.

Lewalski deals with the problem in "Typological Symbolism and the 'Progress of the Soul' in Seventeenth-Century Literature." Rather than adopt less spiritually charged terms such as "allegory" or "symbolism," she insists that the vocabulary of Protestant typology will offer greater precision when dealing with some seventeenth-cetury literature, specifically in her study of the genre of the "progress of the soul."[14] And Stephen Manning suggests how literature and typology may be connected most profitably:

> Typology, then, is not a literary technique, nor can it be reduced to one. But it is a mode of spiritual perception and can affect literary techniques and can resemble literary modes (58).

What one must do when attempting to read literature with the tools meant for reading scripture is first to recognize the difference between the two endeavours and then to see in what way they may be similar. The Christian poet, after all, is charged, as is the Christian architect,[15] with imitating God's manner of creation.

Some few works of literature, from the seventeenth century and before, have been examined typologically. Lewalski's study of the seventeenth-century religious lyric and Rosemond Tuve's book on the poetry of George Herbert are two good examples. Also useful as examples for Milton studies are studies done on two long poems with which Milton was familiar: Dante's Divine Comedy and Spenser's Faerie Queene. Erich Auerbach insists that, while other allegoric and symbolic forms exist in The Divine Comedy, it is "the figural forms which predominate and determine the whole structure of the poem" (64).[16] In Dante: Poet of the Secular World he argues that Dante preserved the earthliness of his characters, connecting it with the "ultimate state of things": type and fulfillment, then, are united (108). Thus figural interpretation of the poem allows certain conclusions:

> We may be certain that every historical or mythical character occurring in the poem can only mean something closely connected with what Dante knew of his historical or mythical existence, and that the relationship is one of fulfillment and figure; we must always be careful not to deny their earthly existence altogether, not to confine ourselves to an abstract, allegorical interpretation. (73)

In this way, Auerbach manages to navigate between the wholly allegorical and the simply literal readings of the Comedy.[17] He applied to a work most often read in the light of the Medieval fourfold method of interpretation the method which even in scriptural exegesis opposed it, and his work offers reasonable solutions to problems which otherwise appear in soluble.

Spenser's Faerie Queene has received some of the same attention, especially in Robin Wells' Spenser's Faerie Queene and the Cult of Elizabeth. Wells' contention is that on two levels -- the moral and political -- Spenser's allegory conforms to a continuous pattern of meaning (3). Spenser mixes the moral and the typological,[18] so that Britomart may be both a representative of the abstract quality "chastity" and a "historical" type foreshadowing Queen Elizabeth (8). He argues that Spenser's view of history is consistent with a typological view: "Typology is essentially the product of a theory of history which sees events not simply as sequence, but as significant elements of a divine plan" (7). The difference, of course, between Biblical typology or even Dante~~'s~~ Divine Comedy and Spenser's poem is that Spenser combines historical characters, the antitypes, with fictional ones. He can be said, then, to invent the types so that the antitypes may be seen to be a proper fulfillment, a necessary consequence in the unfolding of history with shadowy figures projecting the later appearance of the antitypes. Dante knew, or knew of, the historical reality of all his characters, and so they could reasonably be thought types; Spenser's types were largely fictional, although the historical identification of Arthur with the Tudor line gave some historical reality to the connection between types and antitypes.

Samson Agonistes has come under some scrutiny from critics who see in typology answers to the questions about why Milton chose the Old Testament story, and about how the work fits in with Paradise Regained and Paradise Lost.[19] Typological readings of Samson address these questions by attempting to place the poem in a Christian context. Indeed, they do for Samson Agonistes what typological exegesis did for the Old Testament. In both cases the Old Testament is made palatable by placing it in a relationship with Christianity. What they must do first is to explain both why there are no references in the play to any fulfillment to come and why even the traditional typological connections between Samson and Christ are not exploited.[20] The absence of Christian references in a play composed wholly of dialogue between Old Testament characters is not surprising: such information had not yet been revealed. Typological readings attempt to find some other ground on which to base a Christian interpretation of the play.

T.S.K. Scott-Craig, for example, examines a connection between Samson and Christ present in the word "Nasarite." In Matthew 2.23 the prophesy "He shall be called a Nazarene" is said to have been fulfilled by the holy family's residence in Nazareth. That prophecy comes from Judges 13.5, when Manoah's wife is warned by the angel neither to drink alcohol nor to eat unclean food:

> For lo, thou shalt conceive, and bear a son; and no rasor shall come on his head: for the child shall be a Nazarite unto God from the womb: and he shall begin to deliver Israel out of the hand of the Philistine.

Scott-Craig suggests that in Luther and Calvin's writings, the prophecy is overlooked, because it emphasizes the ceremonial, ritualistic aspects of Judges (51), but that Milton, under the influence of John Diodati,[21] could have taken the prophecy as an example of the prefiguring of Christ by Samson (52).

While Lewalski in "Samson Agonistes and the 'Tragedy' of the Apocalypse" also argues for a typological reading of the play, she believes that it is not Christ who is prefigured but rather the body of the Christian elect, "both in their earthly life of spiritual trial and suffering and in their hope ultimately to 'judge' the world with Christ at the Apocalypse" (1054). This, then, is the typology of the end of the world, and Dalila is the type of the Whore of Babylon (1061). Within this scheme, Samson's militant and vengeful qualities need not be seen as Christian flaws, but rather as qualities appropriate to the judge (1061). William Madsen also takes up the typology of Samson, and makes clear that while Samson is meant to recall Christ, the one character is not meant to be "collapsed" into the other. The significance of the typological connection comes in the difference in levels of awareness between the two. Samson, a man under the old law, never recognizes the point his action makes, that humiliation exalts:

> If ... Samson is viewed first of all as a concrete individual living in a concrete historical situa tion, then his significance for the Christian reader lies primarily in his inability to measure up to the heroic norm delineated in Paradise Regained. For it is humiliation that exalts, not the ruin of a pagan temple .... Living before the age of the Word, he cannot see the lively image of Christ (201-2).

Indeed, Madsen defends Samson as a Christian poem despite its lack of explicit Christian symbols or references, arguing that the critics' disagreement is due to the special complexity of the poem:

> It is complex because it is both Hebraic and Christian in much the same way that the Old Testament may be considered both Hebraic and Christian. Just as the seventeenth-century Christian was instructed to read the Old Testament with an eye to "Christ and his mysteries," so would Milton expect Samson Agonistes to be read. It must be read, in a word, typologically. (186)

All these readings of the poem suggest that a full interpretation of the drama lies, not in the text, but in the mind of the enlightened Christian, with the help of a mode of reading learned from scriptural interpretation. Milton works within the mode of the Old Testament, attempting as far as possible to reproduce a literary work which is faithful to the original under the old law and which allows an audience under the new dispensation to use its exegetical tools, the knowledge of the New Testament and the awareness that Old Testament characters are shadows of Christ's life. With these tools, Milton's readers need not be given explicit connections between Samson and Christ; they have been taught to draw these connections between such biblical characters before, and here they need only extend themselves to the understanding of a literary work.

These readings also have in common a reliance on connections between characters in the play and characters in other writing, namely the New Testament. Again, one book is meant to be read in terms of another. Typological readings of Paradise Lost do not rely on other writing for the connecting characters. They rely only on the reader's habit of under standing characters in terms of one another; all the necessary characters exist within the poem.

Of course, there is a difference between Milton's use of typology and that of Dante and Spenser. Milton uses not only characters whose historical reality is in the seventeenth century a given, but also characters from the Old Testament who are regularly subjected to figural readings. If we accept, moreover, that Milton expected Samson to be read typologically, despite its absence of overt Christianity, so much more likely is it that Paradise Lost, which contains both Christ and characters from the Old Testament, should be similarly read. As well, the language of the last two books of the epic is explicitly typological.

Those last books have not generally been well-received. From the eighteenth century on, the books have frequently been seen as a poor way to finish the epic: too much information in a style unworthy of the rest of the poem.[22] Criticism of Paradise Lost over the last thirty years has often come to the defence of the poem's much-maligned Books XI and XII. C.S. Lewis' frequently cited comment that Michael's prophecy represents an "untransmuted lump of futurity" has been countered by claims of its necessity either to the structural design or to the symbolic patterns of the rest of the epic.[23] There is, however, in the relationship of Michael's postlapsarian typological connections to the prelapsarian hierarchy, another reason for those last books. Through hierarchy and then typology mankind understands its place, and the latter acts as a key to the understanding of the former.

The parallels between such characters as Adam and Satan or Eve and Sin are connections made by similar actions, phrases, or relationships with other characters, and it is through such juxtapositions that a proper judgement of motives and actions may be made. In the poem's last two books, there is a key to these connections in the typology Michael reveals to Adam. This typological arrangement of history, in which one historical figure can be properly understood only in comparison with another, provides a model for understanding other characters who are connected not through the passing of time, but rather by the vertical hierarchy that leads from lower creatures to God. Typology provides postlapsarian mankind with a means of understanding its own position in relation to Christ, while before the fall Adam and Eve understand their own positions in relation to God by means of an atemporal hierarchy. Milton cleverly exploits this well-known technique of Biblical exegesis, inviting his reader to understand the epic by means of that technique, and in doing so he imitates the means by which God wrote the scriptures. Just as Old Testament characters are not fully understood without reference to the New Testament, Milton's characters are not to be understood in isolation from each other.

Paradise Lost is explicitly typological in its last two books; this sixth of the poem is to impress upon Adam his own position in human history.While these books connect postlapsarian generations by the passage of time, they also offer a key to the prelapsarian connections between characters. Just as the revelation in time of similar types allows Adam to comprehend the identity and role of Christ and his own place in relation to the Messiah, so the vertical movement before the fall from man to God through God's various images allows mankind to comprehend God and its own place in relation to God. Michael, instructed by the Father, gradually teaches Adam both about the immediate consequences of original sin and about its more distant and more consolatory consequences. The two books, especially Book XII, show Adam that his own importance -- and the importance of those single good men who follow him -- rests largely in their prefiguration of Christ.

Even before Michael begins his narration, Book XI has begun with a typical event:

> He ended, and the Son gave signal high
> To the bright Minister that watch'd: hee blew
> His Trumpet, heard in Oreb since perhaps
> When God descended, and perhaps once more
> To sound at general Doom. (XI.72-76)

The trumpet blast may be repeated twice, once when God descends to institute Mosaic law and perhaps again at the Last Judgement. On all three occasions, judgement is heralded: first to the angels who are to be told of the humans' sin and punishment, secondly to the tribe of Israel who are given the Law by which they will be judged, and finally to all those who are judged at the world's end. Here the typology is eschatological; the life of Christ and of the Christian church are skipped over in favour of moments of judgement. The whole of human history after the fall is encapsulated in the coincidence of trumpet blasts, from the immediate judgement, to the law necessary after that fall, to the eventual summary judgement. The incarnated Christ's role in that history -- as opposed to the Son's -- is ignored here. While preparation is made for the typological history that is to come through the narrator's interpretation of that one event -- a trumpet blast -- in the context of other such events, the emphasis is still on judgement. Not until Michael talks with Adam is the consolation of Christ's place in human history made clear.

When God tells the angels what has occurred, he instructs Michael to take the human pair consolation. In those instructions, God outlines the basis for future typological readings:

> reveal
> To Adam what shall come in future days,
> As I shall thee enlighten, intermix

> My Cov'nant in the woman's seed renew'd.
> (XI.113-16)

Michael will do in his commentary on the vision and in his narration what God does in human history: the life of Christ will be intermingled with the Old Testament history. But while in God's words it is the "Cov'nant in the woman's seed" that is to be reiterated, most obvious is Adam's own place in the line of figures leading to Christ.

While the typology of Paradise appears frequently in the Old Testament, references to a second Adam are infrequent until Saint Paul's Epistles (Danielou 18). In Romans 5:14 Paul mentions Adam's place in the typing of Christ:

> Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come.

And again in the first letter to the Corinthians:

> For as in Adam all men die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.

While the first Adam gives us our fleshly life, the second Adam, Christ, gives the spirit. In Ephesians, too, Christ is the antitype of Adam, while Eve is the type of the Church. Danielou writes that in St. Paul, "the parallel between Adam and Christ bore a twofold aspect: Christ both accomplishes and restores what had been done by Adam" (30). It is a new beginning, a restoration, and it surpasses Adam's work:

> The similarities, which are the very basis of typology, are intended to bring into relief the unity of the divine plan. . . . Typology reveals analogies which are a unifying thread of all, bestowing as it were the signature of God on his work, and guaranteeing the authenticity of Scripture. (30)

The primary importance of Adam is clearest in Book XI, where the covenant itself is not mentioned, but Michael reveals four visions -- the death of Cain, the Lazar house, the marriages of the sons of God and the daughters of men, and the flood -- which are meant to school Adam in those virtues in which his sin proved him lacking. In the first two visions, Adam learns what death is -- death by violence, sickness, or old age -- and concludes with the stoic lesson he has drawn: "Henceforth I fly not death, nor would prolong / Life much" (XI.547-8). The schooling is necessary, given his earlier claim that "the bitterness of death / Is past, and we shall live" (157-8). He must make two more errors and be twice corrected in that book; it is through the vision of the improper marriages, which Adam first believes suggest "more hope / Of peaceful days" (599-600), that he learns to "Judge not what is best / By pleasure" (603), and at the flood he overcomes his urge to despair. Through this book, then, the most important lessons Adam must learn are about his own conduct, how he should best face the rest of his life. The covenant that God suggested Michael intermix is curiously absent from the archangels' earlier revelations.

It is in Book XII that Adam's own character is less of an issue than his understanding of God's promise. Here, as the method of communication changes from vision to narrative, Michael begins to "intermix" the earlier promise for Eve's progeny with that progeny's history,[24] from Nimrod and the tower of Babel to Abraham, the Egyptian captivity, Moses, the Babylonian captivity, and finally Christ. The pattern of this book's history is a series of troughs and peaks, with bad men and captivity giving way to good men and freedom.

Something like this pattern appears in Book XI, where Enoch and Noah, and to a lesser extent Abel, were single good men of faith in faithless times, but in the last book the good men are in Michael's words made more explicitly Christian types: Michael mentions with his description of each good man the promise God made. Abraham's role is largely as progenitor, the man in whose "seed / All Nations shall be blest" (XII.125-6). In case that reference to the "seed" were not clear enough for Adam to catch, Michael makes the point again:

> This ponder, that all Nations of the Earth
> Shall in his Seed be blessed; by that Seed
> Is meant thy great deliverer, who shall bruise
> The Serpent's head; whereof to thee anon
> Plainlier shall be reveal'd. (XII.147-51)

The promise that God made in Book X is thus reiterated ("Her Seed shall bruise thy head, thou bruise his heel" [181]). When Moses appears, Michael again explains the Law in terms of a new law, saying that the commandments are

> part such as appertain
> To civil Justice, part religious Rites
> Of sacrifice, informing them, by types
> And shadows, of that destin'd Seed to bruise
> The Serpent, by what means he shall achieve
> Mankind's deliverance. (XII.230-5)

Moses is to act in the place of God's mediator, Christ, "whose high Office now / *Moses* in figure bears, to introduce / One greater" (XII.240-42). The archangel uses the three most common terms for the relationships between Old and New Testament: "types," "figures," and "shadows." There are two types here, one in the rituals decreed by God and the other in the function of Moses: one is a recurring event, the other a typical character. Both prefigure the life of Christ, the first his sacrifice, the second his role as mediator, and the function of the earlier "shadow" lies in its preparation for Christ,

> that when they see
> Law can discover sin, but not remove,
> Save by those shadowy expiations weak,
> The blood of Bulls and Goats, they may conclude
> Some blood more precious must be paid for Man,
> Just for unjust. (XII.289-94)

The law, then, is given to be resigned

> in full time
> Up to a better Cov'nant, disciplin'd

From shadowy Types to Truth, from Flesh to Spirit,
From imposition of strict Laws, to free
Acceptance of large Grace, from servile fear
To filial, works of Law to works of Faith. (301-6

Michael's previous explanation is expanded: sacrifice of bulls and goats is but a prelude to the greater sacrifice,[25] and the Law is generally contrasted with the new law to come. What is to come sounds very much like what Adam and Eve had lost; they had before been bound to God not by laws but by freely assumed filial bonds. The world's history divides, then, into three stages, with different covenants between God and mankind before the fall, before Christ, and after Christ. Michael further explains the role of Moses in this change from law to faith:[26]

And therefore shall not *Moses*, though of God
Highly belov'd, being but the Minister
Of Law, his people into *Canaan* lead;
But *Joshua* whom the Gentiles *Jesus* call,
His Name and Office bearing, who shall quell
The adversary Serpent, and bring back
Through the world's wilderness long wander'd man
Safe to eternal Paradise of rest. (307-314)

Adam, in response to these words, makes his last correctable error, imagining "thir fight,/ as a Duel" (386-7), and so understanding the identity of the foretold seed, but not the mission. Because Adam has been learning through Old Testament history, first about his own correct conduct, then about matters of faith, his error here is not surprising: he is still in the realm of the shadowy types. He has yet to move from flesh to spirit, from the literal paradise to the paradise within himself. Dennis Burden argues that no progress occurs in these last books: "the climax of Book XII, the Incarnation, is not reached with any notable growth or development. The promises about Messiah are not disposed in any significant order, nor do the types of Christ get bigger and better types. As a drama, Christian history has a beginning and an end, but no middle" (180). What he writes is true of Christian history: no deeds by Old Testament characters in vite through spiritual advancement the coming of the Messiah. God writes his involvement in human history in a manner suitable to himself, not to mankind. That Milton's placement of Christian history in his epic lacks "any notable growth or development," however, is incorrect. The progression rests in Michael's telling -- in the gradually increasing degree to which he insists on the connection between Old Testament type and New Testament antitype -- and in Adam's understanding. Adam moves through the pagan virtues and through Old Testament Law until he arrives at Christian faith through vision, narration, and correction.

Milton's clear use of typology is necessary to make God's providence clear. It is not enough for Adam to see that all will work out in the end. He must see himself as part of the redemption to come through his typological link with the other single good men and with Christ. Barbara Kiefer Lewalski goes even further in her assessment of Adam's progress in these books. She argues that in Books XI and XII Adam undergoes a "progress of the soul" as he sees himself in his progeny reaching up to Christ (103-4): "Accordingly, he is not merely a passive observer and listener during Michael's account, but lives through, as it were, the experience of his progeny, exhibiting in himself their miseries, mistakes, and misapprehensions about the Promised Seed" (103-4). He surpasses the other types, until he becomes the second root. Lewalski goes too far here. Adam does manifest the mistakes he sees his progeny making, but he does not become them, and he certainly does not "become" Christ.

He does, however, become "Christian" in an odd anachronistic way. He has the distinction (in Milton's poem at least) of being the only Old Testament character to understand his own significance in Christian history, and in this way he does surpass other types. He is an Old Testament character who comes to understand that which should be understandable only after Christ appears. In that way, he does live through the history, gaining as Michael tells the story the knowledge he would have were he to live in later times.[27]

Adam thus has more than the usual temporal-figural connection with Christ. The first man -- who often stands alone for mankind and sometimes stands with Eve -- and Christ are the most important characters in typology. Other figures, such as Abraham, Moses, or David, continue the prefiguring of Christ through human history, but they are intermediate stages; Adam is the beginning, the reason for Christ's appearance, and Christ is the end. But the gradually revealed typological relationship between Adam and Christ in Books XI and XII differs from connections between Adam and the Son in the rest of the poem. For one thing, Adam is for much of the poem unfallen; before his fall there is no reason for him to prefigure Christ, because Christ's mission is not yet necessary, although the poem's God knows that it will be. It is with his fall that Adam becomes first in the line of types of Christ.

There are parallels between Adam and the Son, however, that transcend their relationship after the fall, some even in the responses of Satan to the two favorites. Milton makes one of the causes of Satan's attempt to ruin mankind the fallen archangel's failure to ruin the Son. Satan, Raphael explains in Book V, leaves Heaven because of "envy against the Son of God," the newly exalted lord of the angels (604-615).[28] In Book II, when the devils themselves discuss their predicament, they choose as targets for revenge on God the "puny" humans. As Christopher Ricks notes, that men are "puny" -- that is, "puis ne" -- "superbly compresses Beelzebub's contemptuous reasons for hating them (new favourites) *and* his reasons for revenge: they are weak" (66). Since the devils cannot defeat one of God's sons, they will attack the weaker son. But the pun may suggest something else: the devils resented the Son's late elevation, and go so far as to question whether God had actually been their own creator. Mankind is another "Johnny-come-lately."[29] The "arbitrariness" of God in choosing that moment when the Son had for so long already existed, the arbitrariness to which Empson objected in *Milton's God* ("to give no reason at all for the Exaltation makes it appear a challenge," [102]) simply mirrors God's revelation of himself to mankind through history: he appears not when called but when it pleases him. Here mankind and the angels are, it seems, on common ground. Mankind too, "thoughless / In power and excellence," is "favor'd more / Of him who rules above" (II.349-51). Thus the Son and Adam are paralleled because they are God's favorite sons and because Satan chooses, through envy or spite, to set himself against both. The actions against the Son and mankind are paralleled; they are both enemies of the devils, and the determination to attack the second by guile comes when an attempt to assault the first by force fails.[30]

Books III and IX show the Son and Adam paralleled more directly. Both are confronted with the falls of inferior creatures, and each resolves to die for someone else, Adam for Eve and the Son for all mankind. While it is effectively mankind for whom the Son offers himself, God makes the offer particular to Adam, telling the Son to be "in *Adam's* room / The Head of all mankind, though *Adam's* son. / As in him perish all men, so in thee / As from a second root shall be restor'd / As many as are restor'd" (III. 285-89). It is Adam's sin that is most important; as Arnold William notes, Genesis' early commentators agreed that had Eve alone sinned, mankind would not have been implicated in the sin (123). With Adam, mankind falls.

The connection between the two who are at opposite ends of the typological spectrum -- Adam and Christ -- is strengthened by the similarities in their two offerings. God asks in Book III for a volunteer, and "all the Heav'nly Choir stood mute, / And silence was in Heav'n" (III.217-18); a comparable silence is on earth when Eve reveals her transgression to Adam: "Speechless he stood and pale, till thus at length / First to himself he inward silence broke" (IX.894-5). It must, however, be shown that Adam's offering is wrongly made, although the Son's is obviously not, and Milton shows this primarily by making the virtues out of which Adam and the Son act slightly different. The Son is praised for two virtues: love, and above love obedience (III.267-71). In Milton's scheme, as John Steadman points out, obedience is predominant ("Heroic Virtue" 23); but Adam is praised by Eve only for his "glorious trial of exceeding love" (IX.961). While Adam's act is not wholly ignoble, the absence of that virtue which had been so strongly praised in Book III makes clear what Adam's offer lacks. Indeed, Alastair Fowler suggests that it "is precisely the comparative goodness of Adam's motives in acting wrongly that amplifies the extent of our own fall" (1971,490).

Adam's logic is flawed in his deliberation, but there are points of comparison between his decision and the Son's. Adam's decision rests partly on what he believes to be an indissoluble, physical bond between himself and Eve:

> I feel
> The Link of Nature draw me: Flesh of Flesh,

> Bone of my Bone thou art, and from thy State
> Mine never shall be parted, bliss or woe. (913-16)

He mistakes the marital bond for a literal one, and, as Dennis Burden suggests, the passage hearkens back to the discussion of marriage and divorce in Tetrachordon; Adam fails to recognize when divorce is necessary (163). There is another parallel here between Adam and the Son: just as Adam refuses to leave the flesh he is in some way a part of, the Son will assume flesh to become truly part man and part God. While Adam's act of love is praiseworthy, of him obedience is also expected.[31] While Adam refuses to lose Eve, the Son will voluntarily be parted from Heaven and the Father. The Son gives up "godlike fruition" for mankind, but Adam will not renounce earthly fruit. So, while Adam is falsely exalted by his decision -- he and Eve "fancy that they feel / Divinity within them breeding wings / Wherewith to scorn the Earth" (IX 1009-11) -- Christ humbles himself through his. The parallels fit the poem's repeated pattern of "falling to rise" and "rising to fall"; as Adam's supposed exaltation demeans all mankind, Christ's humiliaion exalts both mankind and himself.[32]

The typological relationship between the Son and Adam in Books XI and XII, then, provides a model for the reading of the prelapsarian relationship between the two. Just as the antitype cannot be fully understood without reference to the type, so the actions of the unfallen Adam cannot be fully understood or rightly judged without the corrective example of his greater image, the Son. The two are connected both in history -- Christ as Adam's recapitulation -- and before.

The difference between typology and the prelapsarian parallels is that typology requires history, the sequence of events in time. The parallels Milton uses in the first ten books of his poem are as close to atemporal as possible. They look not forward in time to Christ so much as upward to God -- from Eve to Adam to the angels to the Son to the Father -- but the method of reading them should be similar. There are other characters whose actions are paralleled before the fall, who show degrees of virtue in comparable actions, and those actions should thus be read as the Son's and Adam's are, but they lack the clear connection in time through prefiguring.

That the parallels look upward means that they connect characters who are not equal but rather exist in clearly defined hierarchical relationships to one another. Such connections have two purposes. First, they clarify the proper places of all creatures so that deviance from behaviour appropriate to one's position may be clearly seen. Secondly, they clarify the means one has of understanding those beings on rungs higher than one's own. So, as typology in history is to lead one gradually toward an understanding of an unknowable event in the future, so the patterns in the unfallen hierarchy are to lead one upwards to the unknowable. Before and at the fall the important direction is upward in status, while after it is forward in time.

Most of the poem's important characters are actual "images" of others. At her creation Eve is told that God will bring her to Adam "Whose image thou art" (IV.472). When Adam argues for a mate, God is pleased to find him "Expressing well the spirit within thee free, / My Image, not imparted to the Brute" (VIII.440-1). Their hierarchical arrangement is summed up in the creator's statement that they are created "Hee for God only, shee for God in him" (IV.299). The Son is most clearly an image of the Father. He is the hands of the Trinity, routing Satan, creating the world, delivering judgement, and redeeming mankind.[33] But he has in all his appearances another function. Hidden by cloud or obscured by over-brightness, the Father's face is invisible, but the Son's acts as a mirror, an image in which the

Father can be found reflected. The Son is the "radiant image " of the Father's glory (III.63), in whom "all his Father shone / Substantially express'd" (III.139-40). He is the "Divine Similitude, / In whose conspicuous count'nance, without cloud / Made visible, th' Almighty Father shines" (III.384-6). God addresses him as "thou in whom my Glory I behold / In full resplendence" (V.719-20) and as "Effulgence of my Glory, Son belov'd, / Son in whose face invisible is beheld / Visibly, what by Deity I am, / And in whose hand what by Decree I do" (VI.680-83). After God tells the Son how to defeat Satan, he "on his Son with Rays direct / Shone full; hee all his Father full exprest / Ineffably into his face receiv'd" (VI.719-21). And the Son himself recognizes his own place when before he enters the war in heaven he says, "whom thou hat'st, I hate, and can put on / Thy terrors, as I put thy mildness on, / Image of thee in all things" (VI.734-6).[34] For the angels, then, the Son is the means by which the Father can be understood. Satan's difficulty is that he cannot, because of his pride, accept that he needs a mediator.

The Son reflects not only the Father's aspect, but also his mind. The Son's speech in Book III is largely a repetition of the Father's.[35] The Father, pleased with all the Son has said, praises the Son for his oral reiteration of the Father's will: "All hast thou spok'n as my thoughts are, all / As my Eternal purpose hath decreed" (III.171-2). He then asks for a volunteer to redeem mankind, and the Son obediently offers. The Son both knows what God means and does what God wants.

An analogy for the reflection of one character in another occurs in the relationship between the sun and moon.[36] In Raphael's description of the creation, for example, the moon is the "mirror" of the sun:

> less bright the Moon,
> But opposite in levell'd West was set
> His mirror, with full face borrowing her Light
> From him, for other light she needed none
> that aspect, and still that distance keeps
> Till night, then in the East her turn she shines.
> (VII.375-80)

Of course, Raphael offers an account of the relationship between sun and moon before the fall; after the fall, they do not sit in perfect opposition, nor is the moon a proper image. With the altering of the earth's axis come the phases of the moon (in which the sun is reflected only in part through most of the month) and the alteration of the sun's path to create extremes of cold and heat (X.651-56).

The perfect arrangement of Adam and Eve's relationship corresponds to that between the prelapsarian sun and moon. Raphael describes the creations of the fourth day as "two great lights" (VII.346). When later, through analogy, he tries to explain to Adam the possibility of other created worlds, he uses a similar phrase:

> and other Suns perhaps
> With thir attendant Moons thou wilt descry
> Communicating Male and Female Light,
> Which two great Sexes animate the World,
> Stor'd in each Orb perhaps with some that live.
> (VIII.148-52)

Here the two are not only in the position of original and image or superior and inferior; they are explicitly masculine and feminine.[37] Coming as this speech does just before Adam's own creation story -- a story that ends with a confession of uxoriousness -- it introduces for Raphael the second part of his warning to soon-to-fall mankind. The first half of the warning reveals Satan's errors and shows what the humans should avoid. The second half, which encompasses the creation of the world and Raphael's responses to Adam's accounts, shows the way the created world works -- the hierarchy of sun and moon, for example -- and what Adam and Eve should imitate. When Adam tells Raphael that, although he knows Eve "in the prime end / Of Nature [to be] th' inferior" (VIII.540-41), she seems to him "absolute" and "in herself complete," it is as though he preferred the moon to the sun, or thought the moon could function without the brighter light. The analogy of the sun and moon, however, is an inferior one on the way to an understanding of the proper relationship of God and the Son which man and woman are to imitate. In much the same way that Raphael "accommodates" his argument to Adam's understanding, the relationships between the sun and the moon and between Adam and Eve act as an accommodation, a humanly comprehensible model, for the divine. Through man's relationship with woman, mankind is to come to some comprehension of the perfect relationship between the Son and the Father. As well, that earthly relationship, in which one creature is the image of the other, shows by lesser example how mankind may understand its own creator, of whom it is an image.[38] Mankind, then, learns of God through the analogy of human relationships, and the hierarchy of characters is constructed by a series of images: Christ and man are images of God, Eve is an image of Adam, and their children will be their images. Before the fall, the two humans function in a kind of ratio leading to God: "Hee for God only, shee for God in him." After the fall, they require more mediation in the person of Christ.

It is in Adam's and Eve's relationship that some of the poem's most fruitful parallels may be seen. For instance, they both tell the stories of their own creations to audiences of comparable stature. Eve tells her story to the creature next up on the hierarchical ladder -- Adam -- while Adam tells his story to an angel, on the rung above himself. This is one of several parallels that suggest Eve's inferiority. Adam awakens at his creation in sunlight, Eve in shade, a difference appropriate to the distinction between the masculine and feminine light in the sun and the moon. Adam's "instinct" is first to stand and then to look up to the sky; his next move is to reason the existence of God. Eve does not mention that she stood upright when she awoke. She simply goes toward waters issuing from a cave and lies down, looking not up to the sky, but down into the lake that "seem'd another Sky" (IV.459) -- Adam looks to the sky, that is, while Eve, the image of Adam, looks down into the sky's reflected image. And while Adam seeks almost immediately his own creator, reasoning the existence of a higher being, Eve is reluctant to acknowledge her "author" -- the title she so often gives Adam -- but prefers at first her own reflection.

While the two creation scenes are frequently paired, the similarity between Adam's and Eve's dreams is not so often noticed, perhaps because Adam's dreams occur during the account of his creation. Adam is taken in his dream "as in Air" and brought to Paradise, while Eve is shown the "Earth outstretched immense" (V.88). The devil tells her she can "Ascend to Heav'n, by merit thine" (V.80), which parallels the devil's own rise "by merit" (II.5) and the Son's (III.307), as well as Raphael's assurance that mankind may gradually ascend to replace the fallen angels. Eve suffers in the dream from "quick'n'd appetite," Adam from "sudden appetite." She is relieved to awake and find it but a dream, while he is glad it is real. Adam has another dream of reality when Eve is born: he is "sunk down" after "straining to the height / In that celestial colloquy sublime," while Eve is "sunk down" after "wond'ring at my flight and change / To this high exaltation" (V.89-90). So, in Adam's account of his creation, his placement in Paradise, and the creation of Eve are combined many of the elements of Eve's creation (IV) and dream (V). One major difference, of course, between Adam's dream and Eve's, is that Adam's is true and Eve's is false; Eve's dream in Book V is brought on by Satan, while both of Adam's dreams are sent by God. Even in her unfallen state, Eve is drawn not to originals but to images. In her creation she awakens "under a shade on flow'rs" and is attracted to the image of herself. A voice tells her to follow rather the man whose image she is, but she thinks it "less amiably mild, / Than that smooth wat'ry image" (IV.479-80), which is, of course, herself. When Satan invades her dream, perhaps prompted by Eve's earlier description, he makes use not only of her fascination with the night, but also of her interest in images, drawing her attention to the moon that "with more pleasing light / Shadowy sets off the face of things" (V.42-3). Eve is given one true dream, though offstage, during Books XI and XII, while Adam sees and hears Michael's prophecy (XI.366-69). Two of the dreams, then, are comparable. In one Adam is responsible for the generation of Eve, and in the other, Eve, though she has to wait some time, receives the consolation that she will beget a race which will lead to the "Promised Seed" (XII.623).

But it is not only in sleep that Adam and Eve have comparable experiences. They share a curiosity about the sky above them. Eve asks Adam, the highest authority present, why the stars -- "This glorious sight" --would bother to shine when humans are not there to see them (IV.650-58). Her words are mirrored by Satan's whispers. He too recommends the night, and night comes to mean evil. Satan also picks up from Eve's question an interest in the night and a means of promoting the lesser image -- night over day, moon over sun.

Adam's response is an elaborate way of saying "because we are not the only ones around":

Daughter of God and Man, accomplisht Eve,
Those have thir course to finish, round the Earth,
By morrow Ev'ning, and from Land to Land
In order, though to Nations yet unborn,
Minist'ring light prepar'd, they set and rise;
Lest total darkness should by Night regain
Her old possession, and extinguish life
In Nature and all things, which these soft fires
Not only enlighten, but with kindly heat
Of various influence foment and warm,
Temper or nourish, or in part shed down
Thir stellar virtue on all kinds that grow
On Earth, made hereby apter to receive
Perfection from the Sun's more potent Ray.
These then, though unbeheld in deep of night,
Shine not in vain, nor think, though men were none,
That Heav'n would want spectators, God want praise;
Millions of spiritual Creatures walk the Earth
Unseen, both when we wake, and when we sleep. (IV.660-678)

Note that Adam repeats the notion of the sun's superiority to the moon. He answers with confidence that, as Joseph Summers writes, "their central position in the universe was not so simple as she had imagined" (156). But when Adam has a chance to speak to a yet higher authority, he raises, though indirectly, a question much the same as Eve's:

When I behold this goodly Frame, this World
Of Heav'n and Earth consisting, and compute
Thir magnitudes, this Earth a spot, a grain,
An Atom, with the Firmament compar'd
And all her number'd Stars, that seem to roll
Spaces incomprehensible (for such
Thir distance argues and thir swift return
Diurnal) merely to officiate light
Round this opacous Earth, this punctual spot,
One day and night; in all thir vast survey

> Useless besides; reasoning I oft admire,
> How Nature wise and frugal could commit
> Such disproportions, with superfluous hand
> So many nobler Bodies to create,
> Greater so manifold to this one use,
> For aught appears, and on thir Orbs impose
> Such restless revolution day by day
> Repeated, while the sedentary Earth,
> That better might with far less compass move,
> Served by more noble than herself, attains
> Her end without least motion, and receives,
> As Tribute such a sumless journey brought
> Of incorporeal speed, her warmth and light;
> Speed, to describe whose swiftness Number fails.
> (VIII.15-38)

Summers has noted the parallel between the two passages, but says only that Eve's question is "cruder and more naive" (155); Adam's question to Raphael is partly a rephrasing of Eve's, but in a larger, and, as Kathleen Swaim suggests, more dangerous context (132). The expansion is understandable. Just as Eve had asked the question of the creature immediately superior to her, so Adam does with Raphael. The questioning about the nature of the universe, then, parallels the earlier creation narratives, in which Eve tells Adam and Adam tells Raphael.

Adam is guilty of a number of errors here. First, he asserts, through faulty human observation, the Ptolemaic cosmic order, with sun and stars revolving around a station ary earth. By Milton's time in England, the Copernican heliocentric theory had greater currency, so Adam demonstrates the difficulty of even unfallen human attempts to fathom God's purposes. The point will be of greatest importance in Book IX, as Adam rationalizes his disobedience by imagining what God's real purpose behind the temptation might be. Adam's next error, not a factual one, is in assuming that the lesser earth should not be "served by more noble than herself." He will learn in Books XI and XII that the more noble do indeed serve the lesser, as the Son sacrifices himself to redeem mankind. His greatest error, however, is in questioning the wisdom and frugality of nature's design. As Kathleen Swaim suggests, while Eve asks in essence "why?," Adam asks the more dangerous "why not?", and while Eve asks a direct and simple question, Adam "describes to Raphael the process of his own questioning within himself" (132). Adam, then, finds fault, imposing human standards of judgement. Raphael's answer is much harsher than Adam's to Eve. He argues against Adam's assumption that the nobler should not serve the lesser, then suggests the Copernican alternative for the celestial motions, and ends with a warning to "be lowly wise" (VIII.173). Adam accepts the answer, claiming to have been "freed from intricacies" and "taught to live / The easiest way" (VIII.182-3).

One odd thing about this exchange is that immediately after Adam poses his question, Eve leaves. Milton is fairly careful not to make it appear that Eve is incapable of understanding the debate:

> Yet went she not, as not with such discourse
> Delighted, or not capable her ear
> Of what was high: such pleasure she reserv'd,
> Adam relating, she sole Auditress;
> Her Husband the Relater she preferr'd
> Before the Angel, and of him to ask
> Chose rather: hee, she knew, would intermix
> Grateful digressions, and solve high dispute
> With conjugal Caresses, from his Lip
> Not Words alone pleas'd her. (VIII.48-57)

Here is a dramatic demonstration of the earlier axiom "hee for God only, shee for God in him," although here for "God" should be substituted "Raphael." The passage is only partially satisfying, however. While it may be necessary for the ensuing discussion of marital relations that Eve be absent, Milton has her leave at a moment that should, given her earlier query, interest her. What it does suggest is that Eve's curiosity is neither so profound nor so dangerous as Adam's. The parallel is interesting: while Eve's dream and creation in Book IV are dangerous -- and are frequently cited by critics as examples of her freedom to fall -- and Adam's creation and dream are not, Adam's question about the universe reveals his potential for disaster, while Eve's question is harmless.

Raphael's warning to Adam at the end of the visit to be "lowly wise" is virtually repeated at the parting of Eve from Adam in Book IX.[39] Indeed, the whole purpose of the archangel's visit is to warn mankind, both directly and by example, not to fall, and he leaves with an explicit warning:

> Be strong, live happy, and love, but first of all
> Him whom to love is to obey, and keep
> His great command; take heed lest Passion sway
> Thy Judgement to do aught, which else free Will
> Would not admit; thine and of all thy Sons
> The weal or woe in thee is plac't; beware. (VIII.633-8)

When Adam tries in Book IX to convince Eve that they should not divide their labours, he uses what he had just learned from Raphael, arguing the subtlety of the foe and explaining the delicate nature of free will. As in earlier instances, he assumes the position of the superior being with Eve, the inferior with the angels. There is yet another parallel: Eve's request here parallels Adam's earlier question in a way that Eve's question had not, as she suggests an imperfect excess in Eden, a bounty that grows "Luxurious by restraint" and "Tending to wild" (IX.205-212). Eve, within her own province of the earth, questions the design of nature in the garden as Adam had questioned the design of the cosmos, and receives an answer from Adam similar to that offered to Adam by Raphael. In this instance as in others, the parallels are between characters who are images of other characters. Eve should, therefore, have responded to Adam as Adam did to Raphael. Proper behaviour is demonstrated by higher examples.

The parallels I have been discussing here are those that fit generally the equation "as 'a' is to 'b,' so 'b' is to 'c'": as God is to Adam, for example, so Adam is to Eve, or, in Milton's better words, "Hee for God only, shee for God in him." An examination of these patterns shows what constitutes proper behaviour and for what reasons some behaviour is improper. Typology provides valuable keys to an understanding of these patterns. It shows the importance of context: as Moses gains his full significance only in the context of Christ's life, so the relationship between Adam and Eve should be studied, not in isolation, but in the context of mankind's relationship to higher beings and especially to God. As well, typology shows the way in which mankind is connected to God after the fall and before the coming of Christ: it looks forward in time. The corresponding prelapsarian version of this connection is upward, rather than forward, to God, through the mediation of higher beings who are in varying degrees God's images.

Notes

[1] P. 58. Auerbach's essay "Figura" in Scenes from the Drama of Western Literature is especially helpful in clearly defining typology.

[2] My summary in this paragraph is composed largely of the points made in William Madsen's very helpful first chapter. Included in his six rules for typology are a few I have not mentioned. For instance, he makes the point that the type looks forward in time and not upward to a perfect form of the thing; it is therefore not consistent with Platonic and neo-Platonic theories of essences. As well, natural objects may be types, as in the case of the stone against which Moses hits his staff, but only in certain circumstances (pp.4-5)

[3] Madsen himself adapts his divisions from Edgar de Bruyne's Etudes D'Esthetique Medievale, vol 2, 312-13.

[4] Other Gospel examples are Matt. 5:15, 12:41; Luke 11:30-31, 17:26-30, 24:27; John 3:14-15, 6:31-5.

[5] Leonhard Goppelt, Typos, 127. Goppelt's book is a good source for a discussion of typology in Late Judaism and in the New Testament, discussing the synoptic Gospels, the epistles of Paul, and the Gospel of John separately.

[6] Philo had himself adopted pagan techniques for explaining immoral or inconsistent passages in Homer. Philo, however, took what had been a means of reading isolated passages and applied it to the whole of Hebrew scripture, and while he did not deny the historical reality of the characters and events he read, he believed them secondary to the "true" meaning hidden beneath. For a discussion of Philo, see Sidney G. Sowers, The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews, Basil Studies in Theology, no.1 (Zurich 1965). Davis explains that the Homeric scholars applied allegorical readings to read passages believed unworthy of Homer, or "which re quired allegorical readings to discover their true meanings" (14).

[7] While Augustine sees himself as a reconciler of the two schools, he sides particularly with Origen (Davis 26). Augustine does, however, distinguish between the literal meaning and the figurative: the first is what the words signify and the second is what the thing signified signifies.

[8] Luther. Table Talk. Works, ed. Pelikan, LIV, 46. Cited in Lewalski's Protestant Poetics, 117.

[9] Tyndale discusses the solution:

> Thou shalt understand . . .that the scripture hath but one sense, which is the literal. And that literal sense is the root and ground of all, and the

> anchor that never faileth, whereunto if thou cleave, thou canst never err or go out of the way. And if thou leave the literal sense, thou canst not but go out of the way. Neverthelater, the scripture useth proverbs, similitudes, riddles, or allegories, as all other speeches do; but that which the proverb, similitude, riddle, or allegory signifieth, is ever the literal sense, which thou must ever seek out diligently . . . (The Obedience, p. 340).

Cited in Davis 31. Davis suggests that Tyndale wished so sincerely to be divorced from patristic allegorizing that he called "types" and "typology" "similitudes" and "fore-rehearsed" (31).

[10] Calvin argued against the reading of Galatians as an approval of allegorizing scripture: " Paul certainly did not mean that Moses wrote the history for the purpose of being turned into allegory, but points out in what way the history may be made to answer to the present subject" (Commentaries 116). John Weemse talks about typology as a "compound sense" which does not "make two senses out of one scripture" (quoted in Lewalski 121). William Perkins writes that what seem two senses are in fact two parts of one:

> There is but one full and entire sense of every place of scripture, and that is also the literal sense .... It may be said, that the history of Abrahams familie here propounded, hath beside his proper and literall sense, a spiritual or mysticall sense. I answer, they are not two senses, but two parts of one full and intire sense.

From A Commentarie or Exposition upon the First Five Chapters of the Epistle to the Galatians (Cambridge, 1604), 346. Cited in Lewalski, 121.

[11] Donne is another seventeenth-century poet who makes use of typological examples in his prose writings. For a discussion of his use of the first marriage in Eden and the marriage of Christ and the church in a wedding sermon, see Lewalski, "Typological Symbolism and the 'Progress of the Soul,'" 84.

[12] Cited by Madsen on p. 49. Madsen argues that Milton rejected the Anglican view that the Old Testament types are fulfilled in the church itself, and that the vestments and externals of the church typified the Christian's spiritual life, but that he did accept the historical reality of the Old Testament.

[13] Madsen uses this passage as an example of Milton's conservative attitude toward typology, suggesting that the Protestant reformers had gone so far in their interpretation of the compound literal sense that they began to resemble the Catholic exegetes against whom they had for so long written: "By the middle of the

seventeenth century the distinction between the Catholic theory of manifold senses and the Protestant theory of the one literal sense had, for all practical purposes, become meaningless" (38). Lewalski in Protestant Poetics disagrees with this conclusion (123).

[14] Although her primary concern in this study is with the seventeenth-century short poem, she does deal briefly with Paradise Lost, arguing first that the history related to Adam in Books XI and XII constitutes a "progress of the soul" and then that it is the combination of this progress and typology that gives the scenes their power. Through this process he finally becomes "in some sense" the second Adam.

[15] Again, see Wittkower's fine study of the means by which theories of perfect proportions, ones which imitated those God was believed to have incorporated into the creation of the world, influenced the practical business of building buildings.

[16] Auerbach prefers the Latin figura and "prefiguring" to the Greek "types" and "typology." In order to illustrate his point, Auerbach examines two of Dante's puzzling characters: Cato of Utica and Virgil. The first is a suicide, a pagan, and an enemy of Caesar, and he is thus an odd choice for guardian at the foot of Purgatory (65). But Auerbach argues that Cato is used as a prefiguring of Christ, apart from his historical context:

> The political and earthly freedom for which he died was only a umbra futurorum: a prefiguration of Christian freedom whose guardian he is here appointed.... Cato's voluntary choice of death rather than political servitude is here introduced as a figura for the eternal freedom of the children of God , in behalf of which all earthly things are to be despised, for the liberation of the soul from the servitude of sin. (66)

Since, Auerbach argues, Dante "believed in a predetermined concordance between the Christian story of salvation and the Roman secular monarchy," it is natural that he should interpret Roman history figurally.

The same argument is made for the more complicated character of Virgil, who is generally seen either as wholly a symbol of natural reason or as wholly a human character (67-8). Auerbach's figural theory accepts both the historical nature of the character and the fact that that character "means something" beyond himself: "The figural structure preserves the historical event while interpreting it as revelation; and must preserve it in order to interpret it" (68). The historical Virgil is, then, the figura of the "poet-prophet-guide" (69). Both Cato and Virgil, however, are more than historical figures: they become in the other world the fully realized and interpreted fulfillments of that which in life they had prefigured.

[17] Auerbach is not the only critic to examine Dante's poem typologically. A.C. Charity continued the attempt in Events and their Afterlife. Charity's definition of "typology" needs to be taken into account first, however, as it is rather more loose than those I have been dealing with thus far. For him there are two sorts of typology: on the one hand it is the restricted "science of history's relations to its fulfillment in Christ" and on the other it is the far more open "quasi-symbolic relations which one event may appear to bear on another" (1). The first is the Christian typology, the second is the more interesting, he suggests, to the scholar and critic of literature. What he intends to establish is a "conversation" between the two.

For Charity, the whole of The Divine Comedy is about conversion (167). The narrator relates his own conversion in order to effect the conversion of others; it is this projected repetition of similar events that Charity calls typology and for this reason he argues a connection between the way the Bible and the Comedy are written (167-8). His general definition of typology, however, becomes suspect in its generality, so that a parent's wishing his child the same happiness he had could be called typological. He does, however, suggest a useful notion in the relating of biblical and other narrative literature; the presence of such connections in time may suggest a human desire, which he sees also in mythology, to fix events within a meaningful pattern, what he calls "the orientation of human existence towards the future, the figural and linear connection between a man's life and his death" (257). While this is a useful way to look at the prevalence of pseudo-typological patterning, it may also easily be said of any history or autobiography, in which the author arranges incidents in a way that will suggest progression and meaning.

Charity goes on to say "Today it should go without saying that as a process generally applicable to biblical and other texts such exegesis is illegitimate; and only in so far as the texts themselves can be reasonably viewed as expressing, or involving, or presenting, in agreement with their author's intentions, a typological concept, that is, a concept of prefiguration and fulfillment, are they the real subject-matter of this essay" (3). That is, the existence of typological relationships must be in the texts, not in history itself. He abandons (or perhaps ignores for the sake of his study) typology as something actual in history and situates it rather in the attempts by authors or historians to make ordered sense of history.

[18] Wells defines the difference between moral allegory and typology: "Where moral allegory is usually timeless and characteristically involves the use of signs

-- more or less arbitrary in themselves -- to point to moral or spiritual truths which have a universal applicability, typology reveals a pattern in the course of history by establishing connec tions between events or persons which have a historical reality" (6).

[19] One solution has been offered to the problem of the work's date. It has been suggested that Milton wrote Samson in the 1640s rather than after Paradise Lost, and so need not be regarded as a mature poetic conclusion to the other works, but rather as a product of early reflection. For the two sides of the argument, see William Riley Parker's "The Date of Samson Agonistes" and Ernest Sirluck's "Milton's Idle Right Hand," Appendix I, 773-81. I believe that Sirluck effectively argues against Parker's contention that an earlier date is likely, although John Carey was so convinced by the argument that in his contribution to the Longman's Annotated Milton, he places Samson not after Paradise Lost, but before. Whether or not the date is correct, it is not a satisfactory answer to the problems the drama poses. It serves only to dismiss Samson as understandably flawed, and assumes that a man's last work must be his best.

[20] As Madsen notes, "critics as different in their assumptions and methods as Hanford, Krouse, Woodhouse, and MacCallum agree that Milton made little or no use of the traditional typological parallels in his play" (186-7). See Krouse's Milton's Samson and the Tradition, MacCallum's "Milton and Figurative interpretations of the Bible," Woodhouse's "Samson Agonistes and Milton's Experience" and Hanford's "Samson Agonistes and Milton in Old Age."

[21] John Diodati was the uncle of Milton's childhood friend, Charles Diodati, and a theologian whom Milton mentions in the Second Defence of the English People.

[22] Thomas Newton, for example, wrote:

> The reader may probably have observed that these last two books fall short of the sublimity and majesty of the rest: and so likewise do the last two books of the Iliad, and for the same reason, because the subject is of a different kind from the foregoing ones. The subject of these two last books of the Paradise Lost is history rather than poetry.

Newton adds, however, that "we may still discover the same great genuis" in those last books: "It is the same ocean, but not at its highest tide" (168). Newton's notes to his edition of Milton's poems are included in Shawcross' Milton: The Critical Heritage.

[23] F.T. Prince, for example, writes that they "make a full contribution to the whole effect" ("On the Last Two Books of Paradise Lost" 38), and Barbara Kiefer Lewalski argues for the development of Adam's character and the continuation of an essential pattern of sight imagery ("Structure and the Symbolism of Vision in Michael's Prophesy, Paradise Lost, Books XI-XII"). See also Joseph Summers' chapter "The Final Vision" in The Muse's Method. He writes that although the arguments against the last two books have at times convinced him, he believes that "Milton knew what he intended in the last two books, and that he accomplished his intent" (188). That intent, he goes on to suggest, is to balance the apparently tragic expulsion of Adam and Eve with some consolation, both for characters and readers. Burden has another, though similar defence; the last two books manifest an argument more in the realm of literary theory than of Christian theodicy, in which the hopeful epic is allowed to conquer the satanic tragedy (The Logical Epic, 182).

[24] There is a good reason for the change between the two books from vision to narrative, one better than the angel's (that Adam's sight is dimming) or the critics' (that Milton hoped that some variation in the telling would liven up his material). The division appears when the lessons turn from those which will alter Adam's conduct (teaching him patience, temperance, and fortitude) to those which reveal the nature of the seed. Adam may see his examples in the first, but the second must be seen by his inner eye. It is also a new world in Book XII, wiped almost clean by the flood, and it was after that deluge that God made the first covenant with man. The two books show the difference between Adam's world and the new world which more and more through God's covenants leads to Christ. William Madsen argues persuasively that the Christian religion was alternately one of the eye and of the ear, but that in Milton's time the ear had again taken precedence. Thus the more important information should come to Adam not through his eyes but through his ears. St. Paul said "Faith is not by hearing" and "we walk by faith, and not by sight" (Rom 10:17; II Cor. 5:7). The two forms of revelation -- vision and narrative -- also make appropriate Milton's 1674 alteration of what had been one book into two.

[25] See Hebrews X.1: "For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect."

[26] In De Doctrina Christiana, Milton writes, "Thus the imperfection of the law was manifested in the person of Moses himself; for Moses, who was a type of

the law, could not bring the children of Israel into the land of Canaan, that is into eternal rest; but an entrance was given to them under Joshua, of Jesus." As Alastair Fowler notes, this passage is almost a prose translation of Book XII, lines 307-314 (The Longman's Annotated Paradise Lost 624n)

[27] Why he needs this knowledge is another question. Simple consolation seems a poor excuse for such a revelation; the people to come needed no such understanding, and indeed were denied the possibility of gaining it. Perhaps it is because Adam and Eve had been so much happier that they required a consolation greater than that needed by their children. Since tragedy often involves the remembered loss of what one had before, the consolation must be great in order to erase the tragedy.

[28] God's word is "begot": "This day I have begot whom I declare / My only Son, and on this holy Hill / Him have anointed" (V.603-5). Milton in De Doctrina Christiana takes the "begotten" of Psalms and Hebrews to mean simply "made him a king," and not to imply that the Son was actually created at that moment.

[29] The last position in a series is in rhetoric the one of greatest importance, and the hierarchy suits the Christian teaching that the last shall be first, and the first last. In Paradise Lost, this reversal works for the Son and Adam – and for Satan who had been before his revolt "of the first, / If not the first archangel" – but not for poor Eve, although Renaissance defences of women often posited Eve's late generation as proof of her primacy in the hierarchy of God's creations (See Simon Shepherd's "Introduction" to The Women's Sharp Revenge, p. 18).

[30] Satan in his two attempts follows the general course of the poem from externals to internals: he first attacks, if we are to take Raphael's description at face value, by force, and then by guile. Raphael's account is supported by the devils who talk about renewed attempts by force on heaven, but reject that course in favour of sneakier means of revenge.

[31] A.J.A. Waldock objects to Milton's portrayal of the fall because, he writes, "Adam falls through love – not through sensuality, not through uxoriousness, not (above all) through gregariousness – but through love as human beings know it at its best, through true love" (52). While he rightly chastises those critics who want to avoid the matter of Adam's love for Eve, he does himself ignore what else is going on in the scene: Adam is disobedient. His comparison of this central episode of Paradise Lost with the opening of The Pilgrim's Progress is apt, and he is quite right when he says, "Though we understand perfectly what Bunyan is driving at we cannot very much enjoy the scene: we are forced, as we read it, to suspend a

great many of our customary emotional responses" (54). But, as Milton demonstrates in *Comus*, *Paradise Regained*, and *Paradise Lost*, the most dangerous evil is that which most resembles good.

[32] One typical parallel between Adam and the Son that Milton chooses not to exploit is the traditional association of the fatal forbidden tree and the cross on which Christ was crucified; see Donne's "The Progress of the Soul" and "Hymn to God My God in My Sickness" for examples of the notion. Indeed, there is little attention paid the crucifixion in the epic, especially in the third book. When the Son offers himself, it is the humiliation of taking on human form and the long absence from heaven which appear the true sacrifices, not the passion.

[33] These actions come in the middle two books: the Son first defeats Satan and then creates the world and people, apparently to repopulate Heaven after the revolt. And in Book III and the corresponding Book X he offers to redeem mankind after its fall, and then delivers the terms of their judgement to them after they have fallen. His major actions occur in these four books, and he is the efficient cause as the Father is the formal cause (MacCallum 98).

[34] For a thorough discussion of the theological tradition behind the Son as perfect image of the Father, and of the Son's function in the Trinity, see Hugh MacCallum's *Milton and the Sons of God*. MacCallum also takes up the problem of the Son's relationship to the Father and Milton's apparent Arianism.

[35] Anthony Low argues that the Father's plain style does what Satan's corrupted rhetoric cannot do; it demonstrates the Father's greater authority and shows that the Father wishes to avoid entrapping his hearers with attractive words. They are rather to love and obey him freely ("Milton's God: Authority in *Paradise Lost*." *Milton Studies* 4 (1972), 26). See also Peter Berek's "'Plain' and 'Ornate' Styles in the Structure of *Paradise Lost*" and Jackson Cope's *The Metaphoric Structure of* Paradise Lost.

[36] Of course, the relative superiority of sun to moon, or night to day, was the frequent subject of schoolboy exercises in Milton's time. He has one published on the subject in his early prolusions; he defended, not surprisingly, the day.

[37] Joseph Summers has a good discussion of this passage in *The Muse's Method*.

[38] Kathleen Swaim notes other interesting parallels between the two scenes, which include the love song that directly precedes Eve's question. She notes the repetition of the verb "converse" and "with thee" in the two instances, and in comparing Eve's love song with the introduction of Adam's tale to Raphael she

shows that one difference between the two humans is that Eve is more closely aligned with the earth – she tells him how sweet the earth's pleasures are in his presence – while Adam looks up to heavenly delights:

> For while I sit with thee, I seem in Heav'n,
> And sweeter thy discourse is to my ear
> Than Fruits of Palm-tree pleasantest to thirst
> And hunger both (VIII.210-13)

Such a difference, as I note earlier, is evident from the behavior of the two immediately after waking at their creations.

[39] I am indebted to Kathleen Swaim's article for drawing my attention to this parallel.

Chapter V

The Paralleling of Characters and Events: Satanic Parody

Adam and Eve are created as images of God, and have a place within a hierarchy of such images; their duty is to continue to be faithful if imperfect images, reflecting as far as humanly possible their creator. Their model for this reflection is the Son, whose imitation of the Father they must imitate. The divine imitation of the Son is not their only example, however. Satan and the Devils provide another model, a pattern of evil parody of God, and when the humans turn from Heaven, they look to Hell.

The very place in which Adam and Eve find themselves illustrates spatially their moral position. Earth is between Heaven and Hell, suspended naturally from the former by a golden chain, but joined as well to the latter by the Death-forged causeway that provides Sin, Death, and the Devils with easy access to their prey. Hell is not a space wholly independent of Heaven, but is rather a parody of it, and the frequent closeness of parody and original makes the distinction between good and evil harder to draw. The model Satan provides is not an original separate from God but a parody of Godhead. The image of God that he, despite or perhaps because of his revolt, provides is not merely imperfect -- a less distinct version, as human worship is of the angelic -- but perverse.

Saint Augustine asserts that a desire to be like God governs all human actions, whether they be evil or good:

> Insofar as anything is good, it is good to the extent, differences notwithstanding, that it has some similarity to the highest good. And when a thing is natural, then the likeness is straightforward and orderly, but when it is corrupt, then the likeness is base and perverted.[1]

The Christian must aspire to be as much like Christ as possible, then, but even in doing wrong, the motivation is ultimately centred on the divine. Augustine sees this motivation in his own life; in The Confessions he tells of his purposeless theft of a great deal of fruit and concludes that he "loved the sin, not that which I obtained by the same; I loved the sin itself" (36. Book 2, chap 4). He then lists all the possible reasons for desiring this sin, and in each there is an ultimate desire to possess the attributes of God:

> For Pride striveth toward advancement; whereas thou only, O God, art advanced above all. And Ambition seeketh nothing but honour and glory; whereas thou art honourable above all things and eternally glorious. And Cruelty will have her power feared; yet who is to be feared but only God, from whose power what can be delivered or withdrawn, either by force or fraud, or when, or where, or whither, or by whom? (Confessions 39)

Even in sin, mankind tries to imitate God and in doing so asserts God's authority:

> Perversely do all they affect to be like thee, who depart from thee and raise themselves against thee. Yet even so, by this kind of imitation, do they declare thee to be the Creator of all things; for that there is not any place at all whereunto they can depart from thee. (Confessions 40)

He attributes this perverse desire to be like God even to the actions of Adam and Eve:

> For souls even in their very sins seek nothing but a certain likeness to God, in their proud, perverse, and so to speak, servile liberty. Thus our first parents could not have been led to sin if they had not been told, "You shall be as gods." [2]

All human action, then, imitates God in some way; the only difference between good and evil action depends on whether the action is simply an imperfect image or a perverse. Stephen Helterman, in his discussion of the plays of the Wakefield Master, gives examples of these two kinds of imitation: "Noah's parody of divine rule is sympathetic, since his imitation of God is merely imperfect -- he lacks the strength, not the will, to order his universe. Herod's, on the other hand, is antagonistic because his imitation of Christ as redeemer is perverted; he offers his "grace," for example, in the form of pence" (17).

The account of Satan's parody of the divine in Paradise Lost begins with what could be thought a generic parody, as Northrop Frye suggests:

> The opening lines of the poem, with their reference to Moses' account of creation, lead us to expect that this is to be yet another creation poem like that of Du Bartas, but instead the creation is postponed until the beginning of the second half of the poem, and what we get immediately is a demonic parody of the creation process, as the devils in the deep begin to assume some order and coherence on relatively firm land. (52)

Rather than seeking the "first cause" -- God -- the narrator asks after the agent of "man's first disobedience": Satan. What comes next is an account of the devils' recovery and attempt to make Hell more comfortable; they try to make their place of exile as much like their native country as possible, and in their attempts at creation in Hell they mirror the actions of the Son in Book VI in the creation of the earth.

In that early parody can be seen two patterns that are evident in most of the parodic parallels: a reflection of Earth as well as of Heaven, and the presentation of the parody before the originals. The triple parallels, in which the poem's three main settings mirror one another, show the two forms that divine imitation may take. In the building of Pandaemonium, for example, the devils mean to mimic the actual structure of Heaven -- their architect, Mulciber, is the same who designed "many a Tower'd structure high, / Where Scepter'd Angels held thir residence" in Heaven (I.733-4) -- but their act of creation corresponds to the creation of Earth, as well as to the creation of Eve. Satan, who is repeatedly paralleled with the Son, engages in a comparable act of creating a new world outside Heaven. Pandaemonium rises "like an Exhalation, with the sound / Of Dulcet Symphonies and voices sweet" (I.711-12), while the creation of Earth comes from the Word and spirit of God:

> Heav'n op'n'd wide
> Her ever-during Gates, Harmonious sound
> On golden Hinges moving, to let forth
> The King of Glory in his powerful Word
> And Spirit coming to create new Worlds. (VII.205-9)

Earth, then, rises with a real exhalation, the Word and spirit of God, while Pandaemonium imitates earth's creation, rising "like an exhalation. "In order for the devils to form their new home, however, they need raw material, which they get from a hill into which they opened " a spacious wound / And digged out ribs of gold" (I.689-90). This passage cannot but be recalled when Adam gives his account of the creation of Eve, who also came from ribs taken from a wide wound in Adam, a connection that will be further explored later. Pandaemonium, then, parodies another place -- Heaven -- and in its creation another act, the proper and natural creations of both Earth and Eve. As well as giving the devils two originals to parody, the triple parallels give human actions two models: the true one in Heaven and the clever parody in Hell.

A second pattern in Satanic parody is the order in which the elements of the parallels between Hell and Heaven are most frequently presented. The Satanic parody is almost always presented first and followed by the original. This pattern is especially obvious in the descriptions of Hell in Books I and II and Heaven in Book III, but is clear even in the beginnings of the poem's halves, in the accounts of hellish and heavenly creation. The order is at the bottom of much controversy about Satan's stature. Coming as he does first in the epic, without nobler characters to put his actions in perspective, he seems better than he is. Knowing his audience, Milton may have manipulated the order to give Satan a fighting chance.

It is, of course, in the descriptions of Hell that Heaven is most clearly mirrored, and the means by which we should understand the positions of Heaven and Hell are given us in the first three books through the poem's most obvious parallels. One point should be made at the outset. I discussed in the last chapter the parallels between mankind and Heaven, in which mankind, good angels, Son, and Father occupy specific rungs in a hierarchical ladder, the lower orders all being in lesser degrees the image of the Father and the Son being most clearly so. Perhaps remarkably, the Satanic parodies of Heaven are clearer than the parallels between mankind and God, but while they are more alike in externals, in essentials they are far less proper images. Their fault is that they wish not to be God's lesser image but his replacement. Some of these likenesses are clearly attempts made by the angels, but some are Milton's own. The devils cannot know what is being said in Heaven, for example, and yet they imitate it.

This last point raises a problem in the discussion of Satanic parody. In some ways it is clear that Satan means to imitate God, in the building of Pandaemonium, for example. He intends to make a Heaven of Hell, and in that second Heaven he will reign as God does in the first. Some of the more remarkable parallels, however, occur when Satan cannot have experience of that which he mimics. In the council scene, for example, Satan makes an offer like that made by the Son; the devils, however, were cast from heaven before the Son's offer. Indeed, in this case it is truer that the Son imitates Satan, or at least that God does; the Heavenly scene occurs because God knows that the devils will conspire, foreknows that mankind will fall, and permits both. It is not always true, then, that Satan consciously imitates Heaven or heavenly actions, although his desire to replace God causes him to try.

Many of these parallels come not out of the motivation of the character Satan, but rather out of the poet's design. He shows the desire of Satan to be like God and then the ways in which his actions and the Heavenly powers' actions are alike in order to highlight their differences. Some confusion between causality and accident, which makes determining conscious or unconscious imitation in the poem difficult, is the result both of God's foreknowledge and of the poet's ordering of his materials. God does see time as space rather than as process, and the poet's altering of narrative time, precedence for which he gets from other epics, makes the experience of reading the poem closer to God's own than to the experience of the characters. In terms of the parallels, we usually see three groups behaving similarly and are instructed about their essential differences more than about the process that made them behave so. The poem, then, relies more on the spatial, the "geometric" as Douglas Northrop calls it, than on the dramatic, the actual sequence of events.[3]

The physical appearances of Heaven and Hell are not coincidentally similar; the devils, having failed to conquer Heaven itself, attempt to create a new Heaven in exile. It is not only in the physical structures that they mimic Heaven, however. The desire to create is itself an imitation of the divine, although the means available to each differ. The Devils must create out of Hell, and out of Hell' metals:

> *Mammon* led them on,
> *Mammon*, the least erected Spirit that fell
> From Heav'n, for ev'n in Heav'n his looks and thoughts
> Were always downward bent, admiring more
> The riches of Heav'n's pavement, trodd'n Gold,
> Than aught divine or holy else enjoy'd
> In vision beatific. (I.678-88)

Mammon's obsession with gold gives Hell one of its inverted parallels to Heaven. While the structures of the two may be similar, designed as they are by the same architect -- Mulciber -- the materials differ; what is common in Heaven becomes the valued metal of Hell, the same material that mankind will prize after the fall. What is important in Hell is the physical materials from which they build, while in Heaven the angels focus their attention on the "vision beatific," not on objects.

The description of Pandaemonium's creation recalls not only the physical landscape of Heaven, but also the act of Eve's creation. So familiar is the Genesis II account of Eve's creation that the reference to Mammon's crew digging "ribs of Gold" out of a "spacious wound" will suggest her creation from Adam (I.670-90). Indeed, Adam's account in *Paradise Lost* of her appearance recalls Book I:

> [God] stooping op'n'd my left side, and took
> From thence a Rib, with cordial spirits warm,
> And Life-blood streaming fresh; wide was the wound,
> But suddenly the flesh fill'd up and heal'd:

> The Rib he form'd and fashion'd with his hands (VIII.465-9)

A comparison is inevitable: God takes a rib of Adam and the devils take the ribs of the earth. Both create wide wounds, one of which is healed -- the devils have no power and perhaps no desire to heal the hill they mine -- and both fashion from the ribs something beautiful. It may be tempting to equate the "precious bane" Milton dismisses in Book I with womankind, making marriage indeed mercenary, but the poem's parallels are never so simple. Were that so, God's creation must be equivalent to the devils', and while they are similarly described they are not morally alike. Eve and gold do have beauty and rarity in common, of course, but more significant is the importance attributed to what is created from the dug-out ribs.[4] There is nothing intrinsically wrong with gold. It exists in Heaven as well as in Hell and on Earth, and the angels' crowns are wrought of it. The devils err in their inordinate love of the gold. They elevate it above the love of holy and divine things, and their wrong sense of proportion foreshadows what will in Book IX be Adam's mistake: what was made of the ribs will seem more important to him than God and his command, so that Adam is reprimanded with the words "Was shee thy God, that her thou didst obey / Before his voice" (X.145-6).

The city that the devils construct in Hell is meant to imitate Heaven, but when the two are described the emphasis is on the details of Hell's physical construction, while in Heaven it is the places of the angels and of God that take precedence. Pandaemonium is quickly constructed:

> Anon out of the earth a Fabric huge
> Rose like an Exhalation, with the sound
> Of Dulcet Symphonies and voices sweet,
> Built like a Temple, where Pilasters round
> Were set, and Doric pillars overlaid

> With Golden Architrave; nor did there want
> Cornice or Frieze, with bossy Sculptures grav'n;
> The roof was fretted Gold . . .
>   Th'ascending pile
> Stood fixt her stately highth, and straight the doors
> Op'ning thir brazen folds discover wide
> Within, her ample spaces, o'er the smooth
> And level pavement: from the arched roof
> Pendent by subtle Magic many a row
> Of Starry Lamps and blazing Cressets fed
> As from a sky. The hasty multitude
> Admiring enter'd, and the work some praise
> And some the Architect. (I.710-32)

The devils create a palace with gold on the ceiling (the opposite of heaven) and lamps that look like a sky. Broadbent criticizes the superficial attempt to create lamps like the sky (102), but Fowler says that on chronological grounds the charge is unfair: "the devils' roof cannot imitate a sky they have never seen" (n. 86). Fowler goes on to say that the "moral point may stand: the correspondence is a formal one, non-naturalistic and unmotivated" (86). It may at least be said that when the devils create, artificial lighting is the best they can manage. Despite Satan's claims of equality or supremacy, when he wants light he and his devils create asphalt lamps, while the Son creates a sun. Indeed, the Son's creation of the world is all natural, and so, until the fall, is the world of the humans. The contrast comes down to one between nature and technology, in which the latter is evil. Such "engines" as the devils use in the war in Heaven or in the construction of their new home are unknown on Earth as well until after the fall. Common to the creations of the Son and the devils is the cause of their actions: something needs to be repaired after the defection of the bad angels. God wants to make up the ranks and the devils want to regain some of what they have lost.

Much of the description of Heaven comes not directly but in the distorted reflection that Hell provides. In Book III, for instance, when Heaven is introduced, God's position on high is mentioned, as is the beautiful smell, the sound of the angels singing, and the position of the Son and the angels in relation to God's seat, but no architecture is described. Architecture there must be, however, because in Book II Mulciber is praised not only for the design of Pandaemonium, but for some of Heaven's dwellings as well:

> the work some praise
> And some the Architect: his hand was known
> In Heav'n by many a Tower'd structure high,
> Where Scepter'd Angels held thir residence,
> And sat as Princes, whom the supreme King
> Exalted to such power, and gave to rule,
> Each in his Hierarchy, the Orders bright. (I.731-37)

In this description the place of the good angels in their hierarchy and the control by the Father are foremost, a prominence that emphasizes the sin of the bad angels who challenged heavenly order. Heaven's buildings are "many," "Tow'red" and "high," but no other description is offered. In Book V, Raphael gives a more elaborate picture of Heaven when he describes the angels going to bed, but again the description is not particular:

> Wide over all the Plain, and wider far
> Than all this globous Earth in Plain outspread,
> (Such are the Courts of God) th'Angelic throng
> Disperst in Bands and Files thir Camp extend
> By living Streams among the Trees of Life,
> Pavilions numberless, and sudden rear'd,
> Celestial Tabernacles, where they slept
> Fann'd with cool Winds, save those who in thir course
> Melodious Hymns about the sovran Throne
> Alternate all night long. (V.648-57)

The overly-elaborate detail of the buildings in Hell is lacking here, and in its place are more general indications of size, number, and landscape. Even in the descriptions in which Hell is compared to Heaven, it is the intangible in Heaven that is stressed and the physical in Hell. Here then is Milton's strategy of revealing without revealing, of presenting with relish the details of Hell while only hinting at the delights of Heaven.[5] Besides allowing Milton to avoid describing what would necessarily be lessened in the description, the strategy has another purpose: it shows that the tangible is of greater importance in Hell than in Heaven. The devils themselves are more interested in detail -- especially Mammon, who even in Heaven admired more "The riches of Heav'n's pavement, trodd'n Gold, / Than aught divine or holy else enjoyed / In vision beatific" (I.682-4) -- while God in Heaven is the focus of attention.

Important to the commerce among Heaven, Hell, and Earth are the gates that divide one place from another, and these constitute a major point of comparison. When Satan leaves Hell to go to Earth, he comes upon the gates that separate Hell from the rest of the universe:

> at last appear
> Hell bounds high reaching to the horrid Roof,
> And thrice threefold the Gates; three folds were Brass,
> Three Iron, three of Adamantine Rock,
> Impenetrable, impal'd with circling fire,
> Yet unconsum'd. (II.643-48)

They are guarded by the allegorical character Sin, who has the power to open but not to close them. Satan encounters both Hell's gate and Heaven's on his journey, and it is from his perspective that they are seen, although he sees only the outside of Heaven's:

> far distant he descries
> Ascending by degrees magnificent
> Up to the wall of Heaven a Structure high,

> At top whereof, but far more rich appear'd
> The work as of a Kingly Palace Gate
> With frontispiece of Diamond and Gold
> Imbellisht; thick with sparkling orient Gems
> The Portal shone, inimitable on Earth
> By Model, or by shading Pencil drawn. (III.501-9)

Fowler says this passage suggests that Satan can at this point still repent, after having fled from retribution as Jacob had. There is no St. Peter with a key to the gate; rather, entrance can be gained by prayer and repentance, while sin holds the metaphorical and real key to the gates of Hell.

There is, of course, also a gate leading to Paradise:

> One Gate there only was, and that look'd East
> On th' other side: which when th' arch-felon saw
> Due entrance he disdain'd, and in contempt,
> At one slight bound high overleap'd all bound
> Of Hill or highest Wall, and sheer within
> Lights on his feet. (IV.178-83)

Again, it is Satan who sees the gate first. His reaction to the three gates is varied. He can with relative ease go through the gates of Hell-- he is related to the doorkeeper -- and while entrance to Heaven is denied him absolutely, he can enter Paradise, but out of disdain chooses to avoid the gate. He and his band have chosen guerrilla rather than open warfare, and so he avoids the gates where angels watch and leaps over the wall. After the fall, Adam and Eve will look at the gate of Paradise as Satan had the gates of Heaven:

> They looking back, all th' Eastern side beheld
> Of Paradise, so late thir happy seat,
> Wav'd over by that flaming Brand, the Gate
> With dreadful Faces throng'd and fiery Arms. (XII.641-44)

In both cases, their original homes have been denied them after their original sins.

There are physical connections between Heaven and Earth -- a golden chain -- and Hell and Earth -- a causeway. When Satan comes out of the Paradise of Fools and sees the Earth attached to Heaven by a staircase:[6]

Each Stair mysteriously was meant, nor stood
There always, but drawn up to Heav'n sometimes
Viewless . . . .
The Stairs were then let down, whether to dare
The Fiend by easy ascent, or aggravate
His sad exclusion from the doors of Bliss.
Direct against which op'n'd from beneath,
Just o'er the blissful seat of Paradise,
A passage down to th' Earth, a passage wide,
Wider by far than that of after-times
Over Mount Sion, and, though that were large,
Over the Promis'd Land to God so dear,
By which, to visit oft those happy Tribes,
On high behests his Angels to and fro
Pass'd frequent (III.516-34)

When Satan returns in triumph, his offspring greet him with their own version of the stairway to Heaven -- a newly forged road from Hell to Earth:

Then Both from out Hell Gates into the waste
Wide Anarchy of Chaos damp and dark
Flew diverse, and with Power (thir Power was great)
Hovering upon the Waters; what they met
Solid or slimy, as in raging Sea
Tost up and down, together crowded drove
From each side shoaling towards the mouth of Hell.
. . . . The aggregated soil
Death with his Mace petrific, cold and dry,
As with a Trident smote, and fix't as firm
As Delos floating once; the rest his look
Bound with Gorgonian rigor not to move,
And with Asphaltic slime; broad as the Gate,

> Deep to the Roots of Hell the gather'd breach
> They fasten'd, and the Mole immense wrought on
> Over the foaming deep high Archt, a Bridge
> Of length prodigious joining to the Wall
> Immoveable of this now fenceless World
> Forfeit to Death; from hence a passage broad,
> Smooth, easy, inoffensive down to Hell. (X.282-305)

They construct "a ridge of pendent Rock / Over the vext Abyss, following the track / Of Satan" (X.313-15). And while the other stairway could be withdrawn, "with Pins of Adamant / and Chains they made all fast, too fast they made / And durable" (X.318-20)

More interesting than the physical construction of Heaven and Hell are the parallels between the actions of their inhabitants. The major event that occurs in both Heaven and Hell is a council. In both, the council gathers to determine what will be done next and in each the result is similar: one character is chosen to perform a task -- to go on a quest of sorts -- one to pervert mankind and the other to save it. Hell pretends to be run as a democracy, while Heaven is a monarchy. Of course, the narrator makes it clear that Satan controls what appears to be a free debate. The devils, lacking prescience, have to determine what the proper course of action is, while God knows already what must be done, and looks for a volunteer. Hell's council begins thus:

> High on a Throne of Royal State . . .
> Satan exalted sat, by merit rais'd
> To that bad eminence; and from despair
> Thus high uplifted beyond hope, aspires
> Vain War with Heav'n, and by success untaught
> His proud imaginations thus display'd. (II.1-10)

Satan is, despite his claims of hellish democracy, clearly the ruler here, and, as Milton frequently reminds us, still great in his badness. He also is the most worthy of the fallen angels, as the Son is the most worthy in Heaven. Satan begins his speech to the fallen angels by explaining to them why they would not want to be on the throne -- he claims that his pain is greater, as indeed it should be, for his sin is greater: sin originates with him. He is their leader for four reasons: "just right," heaven's hierarchy, choice, and his proven ability in battle and in council.

In Heaven, God begins his speech after having surveyed the universe and Satan's course through it:

> Only begotten Son, seest thou what rage
> Transports our adversary, whom no bounds
> Prescrib'd, no bars of Hell, nor all the chains
> Heapt on him there, nor yet the main Abyss
> Wide interrupt can hold; so bent he seems
> On desperate revenge, that shall redound
> Upon his own rebellious head. And now
> Through all restraint broke loose he wings his way
> Not far off Heav'n, in the Precincts of light,
> Directly towards the new created World,
> And Man there plac't, with purpose to assay
> If him by force he can destroy, or worse,
> By some false guile pervert; and shall pervert;
> For Man will heark'n to his glozing lies,
> And easily transgress the sole Command,
> Sole pledge of his obedience: So will fall
> Hee and his faithless Progeny. (III.80-96)

He mentions that mankind was created "Sufficient to have stood, though free to fall" (99). Man is thus brought into the parallels again, for Satan, mankind, and the Son all need be sufficient to a task: Satan to seduce, mankind to stand, and the Son to save.

Beelzebub proposes the accepted solution to the devils' problem, but Milton suggests that the idea was "first devis'd / By Satan and in part propos'd:"

> for whence,
> But from the Author of all ill could Spring

> So deep a malice, to confound the race
> Of mankind in one root, and Earth with Hell
> To mingle and involve, done all to spite
> The great Creator? (II.379-85)

The relationship between Beelzebub and Satan here is much like that between God and the Son in Heaven's counsel scene. Indeed, Beelzebub is described as second in power only to Satan, and he gives the suggestion that is supposed to mirror the mind of Satan, as the Son mirrors God's mind.

After the devils' agreement to pursue Beelzebub's suggestion, Satan continues:

> But first whom shall we send
> In search of this new world, whom shall we find
> Sufficient? who shall tempt with wand'ring feet
> The dark unbottom'd infinite Abyss
> And through the palpable obscure find out
> His uncouth way, or spread his aery flight
> Upborne with indefatigable wings
> Over the vast abrupt, ere he arrive
> The happy Isle; what strength, what art can then
> Suffice, or what evasion bear him safe
> Through the strict Sentries and Stations thick
> Of Angels watching round? Here he had need
> All circumspection, and wee now no less
> Choice in our suffrage; for on whom we send,
> The weight of all and our last hope relies.
> (II.402-16)

The necessary qualities here are those of the epic hero: itinerant, indefatigable, strong, artful, evasive, circumspect. Indeed, they sketch what Satan will do, just as God's foreknowledge reveals what will become of the Son. The two most essential attributes for Satan are strength and cunning. He is much like Odysseus, whom Homer repeatedly calls "resourceful." But while the fallen angels plan what is to happen immediately, the Son's promise will be fulfilled only in the fullness of time.

God's council is far more concise than the devils'. He has described the workings of foreknowledge and free will and proposes that mankind will find mercy if a volunteer can be found:

> He with his whole posterity must die,
> Die hee or Justice must; unless for him
> Some other able, and as willing, pay
> The rigid satisfaction, death for death.
> Say Heav'nly Powers, where shall we find such love,
> Which of ye will be mortal to redeem
> Man's mortal crime, and just th' unjust to save,
> Dwells in all Heav'n charity so dear?
> (III.209-16)

God's description of the sacrifice concentrates on two things: mortality and love. The specific tasks that this sacrifice will entail are less exactly set forth than are the tasks involved in perverting mankind, but mankind itself, the object of both destroyer and saviour, is concentrated on more.

Satan's answer stresses the dangers of his quest and the importance of his own sacrifice:

> O Progeny of Heav'n, Empyreal Thrones,
> With reason hath deep silence and demur
> Seiz'd us, though undismay'd: long is the way
> And hard, that out of Hell leads up to light;
> Our prison strong, this huge convex of Fire,
> Outrageous to devour, immures us round
> Ninefold, and gates of burning Adamant
> Barr'd over us prohibit all egress.
> These past, if any pass, the void profound
> Of unessential Night receives him next
> Wide gaping, and with utter loss of being
> Threatens him, plung'd in that abortive gulf.

> If thence he scape into whatever world,
> Or unknown Region, what remains him less
> Than unknown dangers and as hard escape.
> But I should ill become this Throne, O Peers,
> And this Imperial Sov'ranty adorn'd
> With splendor, arm'd with power, if aught propos'd
> And judg'd of public moment, in the shape
> Of difficulty or danger could deter
> Mee from attempting. Wherefore do I assume
> These Royalties, and not refuse to Reign,
> Refusing to accept as great a share
> Of hazard as of honour, due alike
> To him who Reigns, and so much to him due
> Of hazard more, as he above the rest
> High honor'd sits? (II.430-56)

His response repeats and expands upon Beelzebub's enumeration of the dangers involved -- it is a means of further exalting himself -- and at the same time reinforces his right to be their leader. In comparison, the Son's acceptance is far more modest:

> Father, thy word is past, man shall find grace;
> And shall grace not find means, that finds her way,
> The speediest of thy winged messengers,
> To visit all thy creatures, and to all
> Comes unprevented, unimplor'd, unsought?
> Happy for man, so coming; he her aid
> Can never seek, once dead in sins and lost;
> Atonement for himself or offering meet,
> Indebted and undone, hath none to bring:
> Behold mee then, mee for him, life for life
> I offer, on mee let thine anger fall;
> Account mee man; I for his sake will leave
> Thy bosom, and this glory next to thee
> Freely put off, and for him lastly die
> Well pleas'd, on me let Death wreck all his rage.
> (III.227-41)

His two greatest sacrifices are leaving the Father and dying. He goes on to say that he knows he shall not long languish in the grave, but will kill death. One of the differences between the two councils, then, is the difference between certainty and uncertainty, another between courage and love.

Satan and Christ make their actual responses to the demand for a volunteer under similar circumstances. Neither responds at once, and their hesitation allows those gathered to reflect on the request. Both fallen and unfallen angels are loath to take up the call, and their reluctance further demonstrates the bravery of Son and Satan. In Hell the request is met thus:

> This said, he sat; and expectation held
> His look suspense, awaiting who appear'd
> To second, or oppose, or undertake
> The perilous attempt: but all sat mute,
> Pondering the danger with deep thoughts; and each
> In other's countenance read his own dismay
> Astonisht: none among the choice and prime
> Of those Heav'n warring Champions could be found
> So hardy as to proffer or accept
> Alone the dreadful voyage. (II.417-29)

Reluctance is, however, not the sole domain of fallen angels. The hosts of heaven show a comparable disinclination:

> He ask'd, but all the Heav'nly Choir stood mute,
> And silence was in Heav'n: on man's behalf
> Patron or Intercessor none appear'd,
> Much less that durst upon his own head draw
> The deadly forfeiture, and ransom set. (III.217-21)

In the Son's offer is the archetype of the "one good man," that type that figures so prominently in the poem's last two books.[7] Noah and Abraham will imitate the Son in their singular goodness when all around will not step forward. Those who do not step forward in

Heaven, of course, are not evil men, but angels, and yet the situations are typologically related. Satan almost fits the pattern, except that his imitation is a horrible parody of the Son's actions and of the human imitators of the Son that will come after. Satan's offer is to destroy all mankind, the Son's to save it all, and the efforts of the humans, while noble, are but lesser versions of Christ's.

The devils' reaction to the offer mimics the angels'. They rise at once and "Thir rising all at once was as the sound /Of Thunder heard remote" (II.476-7). The devils bow to Satan "With awful reverence prone; and as a God / Extol him equal to the highest in Heav'n," and they praise him "That for the general safety he despis'd / His own" (II.477-83). The angels respond similarly; they are first seized with admiration for the Son, and after the Father speaks they "with a shout / Loud as from numbers without number, sweet / As from blest voices, uttering joy, Heav'n rung / With Jubilee, and loud Hosannas fill'd / Th' eternal Regions" (III.345-9) They too bow "lowly reverent / Towards either Throne" (III.349-50). They remove their crowns and then move on to hymns of praise, where the devils had gone about their own business:

> thir gold'n Harps they took,
> Harps ever tun'd, that glittering by thir side
> Like Quivers hung, and with Preamble sweet
> Of charming symphony they introduce
> Thir sacred Song, and waken raptures high;
> No voice exempt, no voice but well could join
> Melodious part, such concord is in Heav'n. (III.365-71)

The angels, then, spend their time in hymns and praise. Without the central figure of God as a focus for their attention, the devils busy themselves with vain tasks, such as debating free will and foreknowledge, and exploring Hell.

The devils degenerate from their state in Heaven, embarking on those tasks to which much of mankind dedicates itself. Milton's point seems to be that the devils may be bad, but mankind is not far from them. Indeed, he repeatedly suggests that the devils maintain a residual nobility which at times raises them above mankind, as in this passage:

> O shame to men! Devil with Devil damn'd
> Firm concord holds, men only disagree
> Of Creatures rational, though under hope
> Of heavenly Grace. (II.496-9)

Milton's invention of concord in Hell as well as in Heaven is meant to shame his readers: discord is the property of mankind alone. It also helps to show part of what Milton means when he writes that "neither do the Spirits damn'd / Lose all thir virtue" (II.482-3). Satan and his followers are not wholly without nobility, as Milton both says and shows. The notion is still a difficult one, however, since the devils are in fact the authors of discord in the universe. We are meant to believe that they never disagree when they have disagreed fundamentally with the author of the universe and have fought his angels over that disagreement. Perhaps after their fall they no longer have reason for serious internal contention -- they do differ about the means of warfare in their council, but the matter is handily resolved -- but as angels they formed part of a species besides mankind who did disagree with one another. Milton seems, then, to have been torn between a desire to elevate devils and to admonish mankind, and in doing so is inconsistent.

The offers of sacrifice made by Satan and the Son are just the first of the parallels between the two. Of course the reason for Satan's revolt in the first place, Milton tells us, is that Satan resented the Son's elevation; he wanted the Son's place, and through the rest of the poem his actions parallel the projected actions of the Son. The Son agrees to go to Earth in mankind's form to redeem mankind, while Satan agrees to go to Earth to destroy mankind; both take other forms in order to accomplish their tasks, but only Christ takes man's form. The motive for Satan's quest is his own well-being and that of his band; the Son volunteers for a mission whose end will help not himself but a people quite separate from him. Satan's is an assault from the outside; Christ joins himself to man, showing his willingness to humble and sacrifice himself. Satan's is far more like a heroic quest, a travel through uncharted territory, while Christ's requires "the better fortitude / Of Patience and Heroic Martyrdom" (IX.31-2).

Satan does have his own version of the Son's incarnation, however. While the Son becomes man, Satan becomes or is likened to almost everything else in the animal kingdom. When he soliloquizes about his transformation into a snake, Satan recognizes his own degradation:

> I who erst contended
> With Gods to sit the highest, am now constrain'd
> Into a Beast, and mixt with bestial slime,
> This essence to incarnate and imbrute,
> That to the highth of Deity aspir'd;
> But what will not Ambition and Revenge
> Descend to? who aspires must down as low
> As high he soar'd, obnoxious first or last
> To basest things. (IX.163-171)

Satan understands that he must fall to rise. God is made flesh and devil made snake.

It is the nature of angels to be easily metamorphosed. They may be masculine or feminine, the narrator explains, as they wish. The fallen angels change with their fall, and Beelzebub's altered appearance is the subject of Satan's first words. Then, after Pandaemonium is built, all the devils shrink. Once on his quest, Satan first shows himself a master of disguise when he greets Eden's angelic guards as "a stripling Cherub," "Not of the prime, yet such as in his face / Youth smil'd Celestial, and to every Limb / Suitable grace diffus'd, so well he feign'd" (III.636-39). He is then discovered by Uriel, as his observance of the sun disfigures him:

> Thus while he spake, each passion dimm'd his face,
> Thrice chang'd with pale, ire, envy and despair,
> Which marr'd his borrow'd visage, and betray'd
> Him counterfeit, if any eye beheld. (IV.114-17)

He is in simile described as a wolf, a thief, and a cormorant on the tree of life. After he sees Adam and Eve, he assumes many shapes:

> Then from his lofty stand on that high Tree
> Down he alights among the sportful Herd
> Of those fourfooted kinds, himself now one,
> Now other, as thir shape serv'd best his end
> Nearer to view his prey, and unespi'd
> To mark what of thir state he more might learn
> By word or action markt: about them round
> A Lion now he stalks with fiery glare,
> Then as a Tiger, who by chance hath spi'd
> In some Purlieu two gentle Fawns at play,
> Strait couches close, then rising changes oft
> His couchant watch, as one who chose his ground
> Whence rushing he might surest seize them both
> Gript in each paw. (IV.395-408)

Satan is here four- footed and almost always a beast of prey, although killing for any reason seems to have been a result of the fall[8]; his carnivorous incarnation foreshadows the post-lapsarian foodchain, while it recalls Satan's fatal mission. He is found "squat like a Toad" by the angels (IV.800). Satan at this point looks very different than he did sinless in Heaven, as Zephon says:

> Think not, revolted Spirit, thy shape the same,

> Or undiminisht brightness, to be known
> As when thou stood'st in Heav'n upright and pure;
> That Glory then, when thou no more wast good,
> Departed from thee, and thou resembl'st now
> Thy sin and place of doom obscure and foul. (IV.835-40)

Since they find him squat, he is indeed not "upright." He needs another guise for his last attempt on Adam and Eve, and

> with inspection deep
> Consider'd every Creature, which of all
> Most opportune might serve his Wiles, and found
> The Serpent subtlest Beast of all the Field.
> Him after long debate, irresolute
> Of thoughts revolv'd, his final sentence chose
> Fit Vessel, fittest Imp of fraud, in whom
> To enter, and his dark suggestions hide
> From sharpest sight; for in the wily Snake,
> Whatever sleights none would suspicious mark,
> As from his wit and native subtlety
> Proceeding, which in other Beasts observ'd
> Doubt might beget of Diabolic pow'r
> Active within beyond the sense of brute. (IX.83-96)

He usurps the snake's body in the world's first case of demonic possession. All these voluntary incarnations lead him to a last involuntary one, as with his fellow devils he is transformed once more into a serpent at the end of the poem.

Christ's single transformation is far less clearly delineated in the poem; as in the descriptions of Heaven and Hell, it is the hellish counterpart that receives more detailed attention. Indeed, Christ's task is prepared for and is the source of consolation in the tragedy of Adam and Eve, but the incarnation itself occurs in Paradise Regained, not Paradise Lost. Some idea of the nature of his sacrifice is given in Book III:

> Thou therefore whom thou only canst redeem,

> Thir Nature also to thy Nature join;
> And be thyself Man among men on Earth,
> Made flesh, when time shall be of Virgin seed,
> By wondrous birth. (III.281-85)

Here also is a parallel to the monstrous birth in Book II: while through God the Father and Mary (second Eve and Sin's counterpart) mankind will find life, through Satan and Sin he will find death. The Son will also fall to rise, as Satan attempted to do in his transformation:

> Because thou hast, though Thron'd in highest bliss
> Equal to God, and equally enjoying
> God-like fruition, quitted all to save
> A world from utter loss, and hast been found
> By Merit more than Birthright Son of God,
> Found worthiest to be so by being Good,
> Far more than Great or High; because in thee
> Love hath abounded more than Glory abounds,
> Therefore thy Humiliation shall exalt
> With thee thy Manhood also to this Throne;
> Here shalt thou sit incarnate, here shalt Reign
> Both God and Man, Son both of God and Man,
> Anointed universal King. (III. 305-17)

In many ways, Satan's transformation and the Son's are also opposites. The strongest opposition is that of good and evil, of course, and of the attempts to turn one into the other. Like the "as a to b so b to c" equation discussed in the last chapter, this "a=b" equation is one of the foundations of the poem. It comes out in Adam's "Death is to me as life," in the devils' assertion that they can make a heaven of hell, and in God's eventual promise to turn all evil to good.[9] Satan's assertion that he will turn the good of human creation into evil is his ultimate parodic statement, showing his complete perversion. He adopts God's ability to make of something its opposite. For example:

> to be weak is miserable,
> Doing or Suffering: but of this be sure,

> To do aught good never will be our task,
> But ever to do ill our sole delight,
> As being the contrary to his high will
> Whom we resist. If then his Providence
> Out of our evil seek to bring forth good,
> Our labour must be to pervert that end,
> And out of good still to find means of evil. (I.162-165)

Here Satan establishes himself as God's contrary, but in vain. Satan is a Manichean, but God's universe is not. Satan falsely believes himself an equal opponent of the Father -- he claims at lines 247-8 that the fallen angels match God in reason, and are inferior only in force -- but events show he is not even an equal of the Son; he equals, as is right, only the unfallen angels in battle, but even they ultimately have the benefit of twice as many members.

The similarities between Heaven and the Hell the devils try to create are in part a manifestation of this equation. They believe that they can recreate Hell in Heaven's image:

> Hail horrors, hail
> Infernal world, and thou profoundest Hell,
> Receive thy new Possessor: One who brings
> A mind not to be chang'd by Place or Time.
> The mind is its own place, and in itself
> Can make a Heav'n of Hell, a Hell of Heav'n. (I.250-55)

The irony here, of course, is that Satan had already made a Hell of Heaven through his envy, and he is almost right that the mind has the power to alter surroundings, but his is permanently in Hell; he cannot make a Heaven of Hell, despite his weak attempts at a parody of the celestial city. When he sees Adam and Eve "imparadised," for example, his reaction is "O, Hell" (IV.358), and the narrator at the beginning of the book confirms that Hell is the constant state of Satan's mind:

> horror and doubt distract

His troubl'd thoughts, and from the bottom stir
The Hell within him, for within him Hell
He brings, and round about him, nor from Hell
One step no more than from himself can fly
By change of place. (IV.18-23)

Satan begins to understand his state after he has left Hell: "Which way I fly is Hell; myself am Hell" (IV.75).

Satan also has his own version of the "felix culpa":

From this descent
Celestial Virtues rising, will appear
More glorious and more dreadful than from no fall
And trust themselves to fear no second fate. (II.14-17)

The devils think that they will, like Adam and Eve after their fall, be better off in the end. Here the first book parallels the last, in which Adam begins to understand what will come of his fall:

O goodness infinite, goodness immense!
That all this good of evil shall produce,
And evil turn to good; more wonderful
Than that which by creation first brought forth
Light out of darkness! full of doubt I stand,
Whether I should repent me now of sin
By mee done and occasion'd, or rejoice
Much more, that much more good thereof shall spring,
To God more glory, more good will to Men
From God, and over wrath grace shall abound. (XII.469-478)

The difference is that Satan looks for the devils' own glory and for the fear of those who see them, while Adam looks properly to good will from God and glory to God. Satan believes in a similar reversal for Adam and Eve after their fall:

Ah gentle pair, yee little think how nigh
Your change approaches, when all these delights
Will vanish and deliver ye to woe,
More woe, the more your taste is now of joy. (IV.366-9)

As the bad angels would get more joy from a rise after a fall, so man would get more woe from a fall after being so happy. The devils, then, think that they can make evil of good and turn their own woes into joys, but what they over turn is always restored by God.

One of the most fruitful parallels among Heaven, Hell, and Earth is in the presence of multiple trinities. The holy trinity is obvious -- Father, Son, and Holy Spirit -- and although the last has no real speaking part, he is responsible for inspiring the whole poem. Satan, Sin, and Death, of course, parody that trinity, especially in their reconcilia tion scene in Book II. But a third trinity exists on earth: Adam, Eve, and their as yet unborn progeny (which, of course, includes Milton's readers). That last, while having like the Holy Spirit nothing to say, might also be reckoned the poem's inspiration; so much of what is told depends on the reader's own place in the events of the poem.

As with many of the parallels, the diabolical element appears first. Satan meets his progeny in Book II:

> Before the Gates there sat
> On either side a formidable shape;
> The one seem'd Woman to the waist, and fair,
> But ended foul in many a scaly fold
> Voluminous and vast, a Serpent arm'd
> With mortal sting: about her middle round
> A cry of Hell Hounds never ceasing bark'd
> With wide Cerberean mouths full loud, and rung
> A hideous Peal: yet, when they list, would creep,
> If aught disturb'd their noise, into her womb,
> And kennel there, yet there still bark'd and howl'd,
> Within unseen. . . .
> . . . The other shape
> If shape it may be call'd that shape had none
> Distinguishable in member, joint, or limb,

> Or substance might be call'd that shadow seem'd,
> For each seem'd either; black it stood as Night,
> Fierce as ten Furies, terrible as Hell,
> And shook a dreadful Dart; what seem'd his head
> The likeness of a Kingly Crown had on. (II.648-73)

The description of Death begins significantly on line 666, the number of the beast in Revelation 13:18,[10] and his shapelessness parallels the Holy Spirit's. When Satan and Sin meet they have the same problem that Adam and Eve have, but in reverse. Eve does not know the one from whom she has been created, and Satan does not know his creation. Satan's is, then, the first of two recognition scenes in the poem, although it is probably the second chronologically. The scene in Book II parodies both Adam and Eve's meeting within the poem, and the epic convention of the recognition scene. Sin brings about the recognition, relating the circumstances of their first meeting:

> All on a sudden miserable pain
> Surprised thee, dim thine eyes, and dizzy swum
> In darkness, while thy head flames thick and fast
> Threw forth, till on the left side op'ning wide,
> Likest to thee in shape and count'nance bright,
> Then shining heav'nly fair, a Goddess arm'd
> Out of thy head I sprung: amazement seiz'd
> All th' Host of Heav'n; back they recoil'd afraid
> At first and called me Sin, and for a Sign
> Portentous held me; but familiar grown,
> I pleas'd, and with attractive graces won
> The most averse, thee chiefly, who full oft
> Thyself in me thy perfect image viewing
> Becam'st enamor'd, and such joy thou took'st
> With me in secret, that my womb conceiv'd
> A growing burden. (II.747-767)

This tale is like those discussed in the last chapter,in which Adam and Eve relate to their betters the story of their own creation. Indeed, it most resembles Eve's because she tells the story to someone who should know it. Like Eve, Sin springs from the side of her creator, and the left side at that. Adam too has his eyes dimmed, but he feels no pain Indeed, in the poem it is only sinful creation that causes pain: Satan's creation of Sin, Sin's of Death, and fallen Eve's of her children.[11] Sinless creation -- Adam's, Eve's, and the Son's --is painless. The resemblance between the female and her original is noted for both Sin and Eve. Adam describes his mate as "Manlike but different sex, so lovely fair" (VIII.471), while Sin is "Likest to [Saten] in shape and count" nance bright, \ Then shining heav"nly fair" (II.756-7) Also, when Eve is first seen, two books after the Sin-Death scene, it is said that she is formed "for softness" "and [for] sweet attractive grace" (IV.298); Sin won Satan and some of his host with "attractive graces" (II.762). Most important in the parallel between Adam and Eve and Satan and Sin is the reason Sin gives for Satan's attraction to her: "Thy self in me thy perfect image viewing \ Becam'st enamor'd." Adam too will be attracted to sin when he loves too much the image of himself and not the one of whom he is the image. So Sin's story gives in little what will happen in Book IX: the creator falls for the created and creates a monster. The monster in the devilish trinity is Death; in the human trinity, it is the rest of mankind, who will be under Death's sway.

There is another parallel in the reunion of Satan and Sin. They have been separated for some time after the fall, and when they meet they would destroy one another, but Sin's words reconcile them. This happens after the falls of Adam and Eve, after they have fought in Book X and Eve has brought them back together. Adam, after his long harangue, addresses her:

> Out of my sight, thou Serpent, that name best

> Befits thee with him leagu'd, thyself as false
> And hateful; nothing wants, but that thy shape,
> Like his, and color Serpentine may show
> Thy inward fraud, to warn all Creatures from thee
> Henceforth; lest that too heav'nly form, pretended
> To hellish falsehood, snare them. (X.867-73)

Adam urges that Eve's exterior form should fit what he sees within her. That actually happens to Sin after she falls with the angels:

> Pennsive here I sat
> Alone, but long I sat not, till my womb
> Pregnant by thee, and now excessive grown
> Prodigious motion felt and rueful throes.
> At last this odious offspring whom thou seest
> Thine own begotten, breaking violent way
> Tore through my entrails, that with fear and pain
> Distorted, all my nether shape thus grew
> Transformed. (II.767-85)

Her body is transformed into "many a scaly fold, / Voluminous and vast," and she into "a Serpent arm'd / With mortal sting" (II.651-3).

The reconciliation between Adam and Eve is much like the one in Book II. Adam turns from Eve, repulsed by what he sees as her essential serpentine nature, and she calms him:

> Forsake me not thus, Adam, witness Heav'n
> What love sincere, and reverence in my heart
> I bear thee, and unweeting have offended,
> Unhappily deceiv'd; thy suppliant
> I beg, and clasp thy knees; bereave me not,
> Whereon I live, thy gentle looks, thy aid,
> Thy council in this uttermost distress,
> My only strength and stay: forlorn of thee,
> Wither shall I betake me, where subsist?
> While yet we live, scarce one short hour perhaps,
> Between us two let there be peace, both joining,
> As join'd in injuries, one enmity
> Against a Foe by doom express assign'd us,

> That cruel Serpent: on me exercise not
> Thy hatred for this misery befall'n,
> On me already lost, mee than thyself
> More miserable; both have sinn'd, but thou
> Against God only, I against God and thee,
> And to the place of judgement will return,
> There with my cries importune Heaven, that all
> The sentence from thy head remov'd may light
> On me, sole cause to thee of all this woe,
> Me me only just object of his ire. (X.914-36)

As in the scene between Sin, Death, and Satan, Adam misdirects his anger. As Satan threatens his offspring rather than God, so Adam threatens Eve rather than Satan. In both scenes the intercession of the female brings about a reconciliation. A far stronger parallel is drawn, then, between the diabolical trinity and the first inhabitants of Earth than between those first inhabitants and God, especially in preparation for and after the fall.

Parallels between the inhabitants of Hell and those of Earth show the humans imitating in times of wrong choice not God but God's parodist: Satan. Adam and Eve have the ability, presented most effectively through the use of paralleled characters and events, to turn to or from God. They may be seen as lesser images of God or as perverse versions. Either way, they find themselves imitating him. While it is clearest, then, that Adam and Eve imitate the heavenly host intheir adherence to the prelapsarian hierarchical positions assigned them, their disobedience also represents an attempt to be like God, to follow the pattern Satan and his band established when they set themselves up in opposition to and in place of God.

Through such parallels of characters and events the drama of fall, repentance, and salvation is worked out among three comparable groups. Those in Heaven, of course, will not fall, and those in Hell will not repent. Between them is the human story. The problem that faces Adam and Eve throughout is how to imitate the heavenly trinity without allowing their imitation to become the parody of the hellish trinity. The levels of imitation show both the number of ways of divine imitation that exist and the difficulty of determining what is original and what parody. They also suggest that in the world of the poem, Augustine is right: all actions, good or evil, are alike in their desire to be godlike, and "when a thing is natural, then is the likeness straightforward and orderly, but when it is corrupt, then the likeness is base and perverted" (The Trinity 16:184). Ultimately, then, all these parallels reinforce the centrality of God the Father, since even in choosing evil Adam and Eve choose a parody of God.

Notes

1 La Trinitie 16:184. Translated in Stephen Helterman's Symbolic Action in the Plays of the Wakefield Master for his discussion of divine parody. Most useful is his distinction between parody that attacks the object parodied and parody in which the characters in the parody are themselves mocked:

> This distinction must be emphasized because the term parody has caused consternation among some critics of the Wakefield Master. E.K. Chambers, English Literature at the Close of the Middle Ages (p.38) is disturb ed by the parody nativity in The Second Shepherds' Play because he sees it as a degradation of the true Nativity. (170)

In Fielding's Shamela, for example, it is the thing parodied – Richardson's Pamela – that is mocked, while Dryden's Mac Flecknoe attacks Flecknoe and Shadwell, not the Baptist and the Lord. The parodies or parallels in Milton's Paradise Lost, of course, operate like the latter; God may be every where imitated, but nowhere is he to suffer in the imitation.

[2] La Trinitie 16:184. Translated by Helterman.

[3] Douglas Northrop writes that the "geometric" analyses of structure "emphasized spatial relations, scenic structure, and symmetrical patterns. They have given a new sense to Milton's architectonic skill and have demonstrated his careful structuring of balanced and opposed incidents and images" ("The Double Structure of Paradise Lost" 76). For a further discussion of the differences between geometric and sequential readings of the poem's structure, see chapters 1 and 6.

[4] Milton himself may well have regarded womankind as "precious bane," but his opinion is not borne out in this poem.

[5] It is, of course, for not using such a strategy in the portrayal of God that Milton has been so frequently chastised. While little of the character of Heaven is directly revealed, God is allowed to speak and so reveals much about himself.

[6] Chaos had earlier told him of the golden chain:

Now lately Heaven and Earth, another World
Hung o'er my Realm, link'd in a golden Chain
To that side Heav'n from whence your Legions fell
(II.1004-1006)

And the narrator mentions it too:

And fast by hanging in a golden Chain
This pendant world, in bigness as a Star

Of smallest Magnitude close by the Moon. (II.1051-3)

[7] The counsel in Heaven is convenient as a means of paralleling the actions of Hell, but Milton's eagerness to match the two may have caused him to overlook one aspect of the Son's mission. It is not sufficient that the Son be willing to make the sacrifice; he must also be able to offer a sacrifice that will appease God and save mankind. While in the human examples, any human other than Noah could have been the "one good man" who saved the race from the flood -- it was his willingness rather than his birthright that made him suitable -- no other being in Heaven could have replaced the Son. His is a task proper to him both because of his merit -- his willingness to sacrifice himself -- and because of his birthright: mankind must be redeemed by a representative of both man and God, and the angels are neither.

[8] One of the effects of the fall described in Book X is the beginning of carnivorousness:

> Beast now with Beast gan war, and Fowl with Fowl,
> And Fish with Fish; to graze the Herb all leaving,
> Devour'd each other. (X.710-12)

The diet of all creatures, not just of Adam and Eve, changes as the state of the world does. (See chapter 3.)

[9] Mammon's advice to the devils to accept Hell and make the best of it shows that he too believes in good things coming of their opposites:

> Our greatness will appear
> Then most conspicuous, when great things of small,
> Useful of hurtful, prosperous of adverse
> We can create, and in what place soe'er
> Thrive under evil, and work ease out of pain
> Through labour and endurance. (II. 257-62)

There are other examples. Satan is "by merit rais'd / To that bad eminence" (II.5-6), which means he is the highest of the low, the worst of all. This phrase, of course, parallels the Father's statement that the Son is "found / By Merit more than Birthright Son of God" (III.308-9). And Satan complains in Book IV that "With Diadem and Sceptre high advanc'd / The lower still I fall, only Supreme / In misery" (IV.90-91).

[10] Revelation 13:18:

> Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast: for it is the number of a man; and his number is Six hundred threescore and six.

It seems too much of a coincidence for the beastly figure of Death to be introduced unintentionally at this line number (there is a 1 in 1055 chance of it occurring accidentally in Book II), but it is a simple form of numerology, one which takes significant numbers from the Testaments and uses them simply. The number 12, for example, stands for the number of tribes of Israel or the number of apostles, and 40 is both the number of days and nights it rained during the flood and the number of days and nights Christ fasted in the desert. The number of the beast is perhaps the most easily recognizable of them all, since attention is drawn to it as the sign by which the beast may be recognized, and not simply as a quantity of something.

[11] The creation of Sin has a second and closer parallel, as so many of the events in the poem do, in the classical tradition. Athena, daughter of Zeus and goddess of knowledge, is born out of her father's head, an allusion that equates in some way knowledge and sin. The equation is, of course, borne out elsewhere in the poem, since the poem's central sin is a command not to touch the Tree of Knowledge; sin there equals the attempt to attain, not simply knowledge, but forbidden knowledge.

Chapter VI

The Grand Design:
Structural Parallels

The parallels between characters and the repetition of significant words and phrases contribute to the sense that in Paradise Lost everything is connected. The connections are not merely causal; while Satan is in part the cause of man's first disobedience, for example, his partnership with Sin, which parallels the marriage of Adam and Eve, does not cause and is not caused by that second relationship. Rather, the two pairs are connected in the design that the poet imposes on his creation. In so designing his creation, the poet means to imitate God.

That essential connectedness extends to the design of the whole poem and to the arrangement of its twelve books. Most critics of the poem's structure recognize to some extent that the design is dependent on groupings of paralleled events, although they do not all agree on the nature of that design. The analyses divide into two main groups: those that argue for the poem's progressive structure and those that see the structure as static. James Northrop calls these the sequential and the geometric perceptions of structure.[1]

In the sequential reading of Paradise Lost's structure, it is how the poem progresses -- its movement through time and its movement from place to place in a specific order -- that is important. These movements divide the poem's books into groups that have different but comparable focuses. Art Barker argues for this view, suggesting that the two most important divisions are the division into three groups of four books and two groups of six. In the first, Satan, the Son, and Adam respectively are central in one of each of the four groups. When the poem is seen in halves, Satan's defeat and the creation of the world are at the poem's centre.[2]

In the geometric structure, significant groupings do not necessarily follow one after the other, but rather connect books at corresponding places elsewhere in the poem. John Shawcross, for example, argues that the poem divides into bipartite and pyramidic pairs of books. In the first arrangement, Book I parallels Book VI, Book II Book VII, Book III Book VIII, and so on. In the pyramidic arrangement, the first book parallels the last, the second parallels the second last, and so on. Shawcross insists, however, on arguing from the poem's first edition, in ten books rather than twelve, which he believes to be the superior arrangement. The ten-book structure is indeed crucial to his eccentric "tetractyc" patterning, but not to the more readily apprehensible bipartite and pyramidic structures; indeed, those two are more pleasingly paralleled, one book to one book, in the second edition than in the first. [3] Other critics, such as Rosalie Collie and J.R. Watson, who also examine the geometric arrangement of the books, do so from the twelve-book structure, and in doing so show that the preservation of the rejected form is unnecessary to a meaningful discussion of structure.

It must be admitted that a complete rejection of one of these readings in favour of another will narrow one's view of the poem. If the poem is read only for its dramatic movement from scene to scene, its architectonic power is lost, as is its ability to show effectively the all-important workings of Providence. If only the geometric qualities are accepted, important considerations of narrative and genre will be overlooked. Some combination of the two, then, is necessary.

James Northrop argues persuasively for such a combination in "The Double Structure of Paradise Lost." He writes that the two analyses of structure together show the simultaneous existence of time and eternity in the poem:

> Man, immersed in and limited to time, sees the world in sequential development; man, insofar as he gains the perspective of eternity, is able to perceive the geometric patterns of balance and opposition. Paradise Lost employs both patternings of the material because it views the action from both perspectives. (76)

The basic structure of the poem is that of co-operative interlocking patterns, patterns that emphasize the double perspectives -- those of chronos and kairos, or time and eternity[4] -- that God, the narrator, and through the narrator the reader share.[5]

Some parallels that have been discussed already, such as that between the council scene in Hell in Book II and the council scene in Heaven in Book III, are more important to the progression of the poem than to its geometric design. They show immediately the difference between Hell and Heaven, and the second scene acts as a corrective, clarifying the flaws in Satan's sacrifice. This chapter, however, will concentrate rather on those parallels whose existence forms the geometric structure. It is there that the larger parallels are most obvious and rewarding. They make clear the poem's internal connectedness by drawing together events from different stages in the poem's progressive development and forming two basic patterns that both find their centre at Books VI and VII. The parallels draw attention to the repetition of like events or words itself, and less to the order in which the repetitions occur. I will discuss a number of the general parallels, first in the pyramidic and then in the bipartite pattern, to show how the larger design works.[6]

The books that are perhaps most noticeably paralleled are those that begin and end the epic. Books I and II introduce the newly fallen devils and show how they deal with their separation from God and Heaven; Books XI and XII show not only Adam and Eve after their fall, but also the whole of fallen mankind, and the vision reveals how that fallen species will live in exile from its first homeland. As the poem opens, Satan and his followers have just fallen from Heaven, and their downward movement is repeated when the humans fall; at the poem's end, Adam and Eve are taken by the hands and lead "down the Cliff as fast / To the subjected Plain" (XII.639- 40). The plain on which the humans are now forced to live is far less horrible than that on which the devils light when they rise from the waves, but neither is the human crime as bad as the devils'. Each suffers according to the degree of the transgression -- the humans fall tempted by Satan, the devils fall self-tempted -- but the form of punishment is the same: exclusion and downward movement are metaphors for their moral deterioration, and the greater they were, the farther they fall.

In Books XI and XII, however, much of the narrative is devoted to showing Adam how mankind may "regain the blissful Seat": the devils have no hope of returning to Heaven, but their first two books are nonetheless largely concerned with plotting to regain it. The humans will win the second Paradise with the will of God and the sacrifice of the Son, while the devils will attempt to retake Heaven through war "open or understood." Between the loss and the regaining, however, both mankind and the devils require a temporary substitute. The devils build Pandaemonium, in whose construction they attempt to mimic Heaven. In Book XII, Adam is told rather to seek the "pardise within thee, happier far" that virtue will afford (XII.587), but he learns in the angel's narrative the way that his progency will attempt to raise itself in much the same way that the devils did; the building of the tower of Babel is an attempt to reach Heaven through externals, rather than through the virtues as both Michael and Raphael suggest is possible,[7] and in that it is much like the construction of Pandaemonium. Babel is built from "a black, bituminous gurge" on a plain that "Boils out from under ground, the mouth of Hell" (XII.41-2), much as Pandaemonium is, and the narrator connects the two in the form of an admonition to mankind in Book I:

> And here let those
> Who boast in mortal things, and wond'ring tell
> Of Babel, and the works of Memphian Kings,
> Learn how thir greatest Monuments of Fame,
> And Strength and Art are easily outdone
> By Spirits reprobate. (I.692-7)

The first book and the last, then, show fallen creatures attempting to raise themselves to God's height improperly -- in the building of Pandaemonium and Babel and in the wish to attack Heaven through force or guile--and properly through deeds, faith, virtue, patience, temperance, and love (XII.582- 4).

Other occupations to which the devils turn themselves connect their opening books with mankind's closing books. After Satan sets out to find the newly-created earth, the rest of his band seeks to entertain itself. Some contend in Olympian games or wargames; some ride the whirlwinds; some sing of their own deeds; some debate "Providence, Foreknowledge, Will, and Fate" (II.559); and some explore Hell. Many of these are activities that fallen mankind will rediscover, and it is seen to occupy itself with such vanity in the last two books. Punctuating the more worldly activities are the appearances of single good men -- Enoch, Noah, Abraham, and Moses -- whose minds are rightly turned Heavenward. These appearances show the contrast between the irredeemable devils and the redeemable humans; in Hell no such right-minded devils appear.

As discussed in the last chapter, Books I and II present the devils' own version of a *felix culpa*, and that presentation is paralleled most significantly by the revelation to Adam in Books XI and XII of the happy results of his fall.[8] The devils are assured that their efforts to regain their former glory will afford them a glory greater than their original:

> From this descent
> Celestial Virtues rising, will appear
> More glorious and more dread than from no fall
> And trust themselves to fear no second fate. (II.14-17)

Satan convinces the devils that they can make their own evil good by making God's good evil, but in the last book, Adam recognizes that what the devils planned to overturn in the first two books has by the end been overturned again:

> O goodness infinite, goodness immense!
> That all this good of evil shall produce,
> And evil turn to good; more wonderful
> Than that which by creation first brought forth
> Light out of darkness! (XII.469-73)

Two of the strongest components in the presentation of the workings of Providence come in these first and last books: the devils determine to make evil of good and in the end Adam is shown how good will again be made of evil.

Books I and II and Books XI and XII are the most obviously paralleled in the poem, although other books moving toward and away from the poem's physical centre contain lesser but still interesting parallels. Books III and X, for example, are largely concerned with the effects of mankind's fall, one before and the other after the fact. At the end of Book X, Adam suggests their best course of action:

> What better can we do, than to the place
> Repairing where he judg'd us, prostrate fall
> Before him reverent, and there confess
> Humbly our faults, and pardon beg, with tears
> Watering the ground, and with our sighs the Air
> Frequenting, sent from hearts contrite, in sign
> Of sorrow unfeign'd, and humiliation meek. (X.1086-92)

In the next verse paragraph, the narrator describes them doing just that:

> they forthwith to the place
> Repairing where he judg'd them prostrate fell
> Before him reverent, and both confess'd
> Humbly thir faults, and pardon begg'd, with tears
> Watering the ground, and with thir sighs the Air
> Frequenting, sent from hearts contrite, in sign
> Of sorrow unfeign'd, and humiliation meek. (X.1093-1104)

It might seem that the narrator is simply lazy, borrowing the words of a character to describe the character's action, or it may seem a simple attempt to emphasize the importance of the moment of repentance. Two other explanations are more satisfying. The repetition first shows the ritual nature of the repentance. The fallen humans are already at the point where in order to communicate meaningfully with God, they must contain their thoughts in certain prescribed motions. Such ritual action was almost unnecessary in the unfallen world. When Adam and Eve prepare for bed in Book IV, for example, they praise God "unanimous, and other Rites / Observing none, but adoration pure / Which God likes best" (IV.736-8). The passage also looks back to God's prediction in Book III of the human fall and more importantly the grace that will lead them to repentance:

> for I will clear thir senses dark,
> What may suffice, and soft'n stony hearts

> To pray, repent, and bring obedience due.
> To Prayer, repentance, and obedience due,
> Though but endeavor'd with sincere intent,
> Mine ear shall not be slow, mine eye not shut. (III.188-93)

Lines 190 and 191 are almost identical, with the first triplet in the form of verbs and the second nouns. It predicts the paired intention and the action that will happen in Book X, which is Book III's complement.

These are also the books in which Satan finds and leaves Earth. He arrives at the end of his journey on the top of Mount Niphates at the end of Book III, and in Book X he leaves Earth for Pandaemonium. It is in Book III too that Satan has his first transformation -- into a fledgling angel to fool Uriel -- and in Book X he has his last -- into a serpent along with his fellow devils. Indeed, Book X is the last in which Satan appears. He is absent from Books XI and XII just as the Son has not appeared until Book III. The Son figures in these books in two other ways: he chooses in Book III to be the instrument of mankind's salvation, and in Book X he fulfills his other role, that of judge.

Books IV and IX, two of the most important Eden books, are worthy contrasts: one shows the humans in perfection, and the other shows their fall. They are the only books, for example, in which Adam and Eve have sex, and this point of comparison shows one of the differences between their unfallen and fallen states. Milton defends the purity of innocent sex, but not the lustful postlapsarian dalliance, and after unfallen intercourse, Adam and Eve are "lull'd by Nightingales" to sleep (IV.771), while in Book IX "dewy sleep / Oppress'd them" (1044-55).

It is in these two books too that Satan assumes most of his voluntary guises, the most important of which are the toad-like one at Eve's ear -- when he makes his first assault on her -- and the serpentine one in Book IX -- in which guise he succeeds. Adam and Satan are in these books paralleled in their perverse resolves. Satan determines after a debate with himself to seduce the happy pair, saying "Evil be thou my Good" (IV.110); Adam too has a debate with himself when he is faced with Eve's transgression, and he similarly judges, "Death is to me as Life" (IX.954). Adam's decision is in part prepared for in Book IV when Eve recalls his words at her creation:

> whom thou fli'st, of him thou art,
> His flesh, his bone; to give thee being I lent
> Out of my side to thee, nearest my heart
> Substantial Life, to have thee by my side
> Henceforth an individual solace dear. (IV.482-86)

When faced with dividing that "individual solace," he repeats the essence of his earlier argument:

> So forcible within my heart I feel
> The Bond of Nature draw me to my own,
> My own in thee, for what thou art is mine;
> Our State cannot be sever'd, we are one,
> One Flesh; to lose thee were to lose myself. (IX.955-59)

What had earlier been an argument to draw Eve to Adam becomes one to draw Adam to Eve.

Books V-VIII work as an easily discernible unit between the Edenic perfection of Book IV and the crisis of Book IX; the four books are taken up by a long narrative, which serves as the poem's central unit. Books V and VIII have the archangel coming and going, but Book V begins with Eve's dream. Her dream is paralleled in Book VIII by Adam's relation to Raphael of his own dream at his creation. In each case the dreamer tells the dream to a creature higher in the hierarchy of creation, and there is a version of the dangerous phrase in each dream that will reappear in Book IX: "He pluckt, he tasted" (V.65); "she pluck'd, she eat" (IX.781). Eve's dream clearly contains a warning of her fall; she is tempted in the dream and will succumb to the temptation to become like a god. Adam has a comparable warning in Book VIII, though his is in the form of an actual warning from Raphael rather than in an earlier temptation. He confesses to Raphael that Eve seems to him better than she is, and it is this error in judgement that will lead to his fall. Books V and VIII, then, prepare for each fall, Eve's and then Adam's.

Book V also contains the account of the elevation of the Son, which is balanced in Book VIII by Adam's account of his own creation. Each is followed by an attempt by Satan. He first objects to the Son's. elevation and wages war in heaven, and then when he hears of the creation of new favorite creatures on earth he determines to wage understood war with them. The accounts of the first appearances of God's two favorites, the Son and mankind, come in paralleled books.

Books VI and VII are the central books in the poem, and within them are the important accounts of the defeat of the bad angels and the creation of the world. Milton makes the dividing point of his poem clear at the opening of Book VII; he includes an invocation and states that "Half yet remains unsung" (VII.211). In those middle books, Heaven is depleted and preparation is made for the repair of the ranks by the creation of mankind. The Son's role is most important in these books -- and the pyramidic structure, moving towards and away from those middle books, emphasizes his importance and centrality.

Not only are the books divided in the centre in that way, but they also fall into two sections, with the first six books repeating in order the second. Again, the centre is at Books VI and VII, with Book VI the end of the first section and Book VII the beginning of the second. The first section begins with the devils' arrival in Hell and their creation of Pandaemonium, and it ends where it began, with their expulsion from Heaven. The second section centres on the humans rather than on the devils, and begins with the creation of their world and ends with their expulsion. In part, the second section ends where it begins as well, with the promise of a recreation after the fall. In both sections, then, the movement is somewhat cyclical, ending where it began and mirroring the other section.

The parallels in this pattern, which Shawcross calls the "bipartite" structure, are not so prominent as in the pyramidic. They exist primarily at the beginnings and ends with fewer examples between. In Book I there are the general parallels of the creation of Pandaemonium and of Earth, with the specific parallels of the Son's creation of the sun matched with the devils' artificial lights. Book II contains the appearance of Sin and her recognition by Satan, which is matched by the account of Eve's creation and her recognition of the creature from whom she sprang.

Book III and IX are more closely matched, beginning with their invocations. The poem contains four such invocations, at Books I, III, VII, and IX, the opening and third books of each of the two sections in the bipartite structure. The invocations at Books I and VII ask primarily for the ability to tell the story, all of it in Book I and the rest of it in Book VII. The invocations that begin Books III and IX, however, request inspiration at moments of particular importance. Book III is the first in which the narrator ventures to tells of Heaven, and it is in this book that mankind's redemption is confirmed before he has fallen. Book IX requires the narrator to relate the particulars of the fall itself. The paralleling of the two books should serve to lessen the tragedy of the fall, since a redemption has been planned in advance.

It is in these two books that Adam and the Son are most clearly paralleled. Both are challenged to sacrifice themselves to save a fallen creature, both are praised for their love, and both also respond to the request from a close relative – Adam to his wife and the Son to his Father. Earth has a council scene similar to that in Heaven when Eve tries to convince Adam to eat and Adam battles within himself. Their choices are similar, although Adam chooses wrongly and the Son rightly. The difference is, of course, that Adam's choice involves preferring a lesser relationship -- with Eve -- to a greater -- with God

The pairing of Books IV and X works much like the pairing of Books IV and IX: the most illustrative paradisal book is contrasted with the books that show the immediate results of the fall. Book IV, for example, shows Adam and Eve in perfect unpremeditated prayer "Which God likes best" (IV.738), while in Book X their prayer is premeditated: Adam suggests that they go to the place of judgement and beg pardon, which they are then described as doing in much the same words. Gone are the immediate prayers of praise, and in their place are prepared prayers of repentance.

Books V and XI are connected by the arrival of archangels sent to relate from God stories that will warn and comfort respectively. Books VI and XII show the devils and the humans exiled from their original homes, chased or lead down by good angels. In Book VI, too, is there the introduction of a type of the one good man --the angel Uriel -- whose singular action against his fellows in favour of God will be imitated in the last two books by Enoch, Noah, Abraham, and Moses. Jason Rosenblatt makes a convincing argument for a series of parallels between the account of the routing of the bad angels in Book VI and the exodus lead by Moses in Book XII. He identifies the Pharaoh with Satan and Abdiel with Moses. Rosenblatt argues that the whole structure of the account of the war in Heaven is based on the scriptural account in Exodus, and that the parallel is essential to the structure of the poem. The war in Heaven, appearing at the exact centre of the poem and overlaid with the Exodus account, radiates meaning to the beginning and the end. Describing the celestial battle in terms of the Exodus heightens our esthetic apprehension of the poem as a wholly unified structure, by establishing a concordance of beginning, middle and end. This structural unity reflects a temporal concordance. At certain moments in Books I, VI, and XII, time assumes an elastcity by means of which a universally recognized event calls forth larger events of the past and future. ("Structural Unity and Temporal Concordance: the War in Heaven in Paradise Lost" 36) His argument for the connections between Book I, VI, and XII suggests both the pyramidic structure, in which Books I and XII are matched, and the bipartite, in which Book VI matches Book XII. War in Heaven in matched by the description of war on earth.

A series of parallels, then, connects the books of Paradise Lost in two patterns: one in which the corresponding books lead to and from the central books, and one in which the halves of the poem, I-VI and VII-XII, repeat one another in significant ways. In either pattern the emphasis at the centre is on the actions of the Son, who casts out the devils at the end of Book VI and has just cast them out in Book I, and who creates the world in Book VII and whose recreation of the world is foretold in Book XII. The patterns stress the defeat of Satan and the salvation of mankind, both through the agency of the Son.

The geometric patterns also help in the apprehension of eternity in the poem. They superimpose on one time the events of another and so afford a vision of the pattern of God's providenial design. Two other things contribute to this geometric vision of time. The rearrangement of chronological order at times delays the advance of the drama of Adam and Eve. Milton has used two epic conventions -- the beginning in media res and the interpolated narratives of Raphael, Eve, Adam, and Michael -- to introduce into his matter events from the beginning of the universe to its end. While the action proper, from Satan's plotting in Book I to Adam and Eve's expulsion in Book XII, takes but a few days, almost half of the poem -- most of Books V through VIII and Books XI and XII -- tells of events related to but not part of the central action: the creation of the world, the exaltation of the Son, the war in Heaven, the expulsion of the bad angels, the creation of Adam and of Eve, the history of mankind after the fall, the coming of Christ, and the end of the world. Most epics, of course, do situate the central matter in a larger framework, one that emphasizes the significance of the main events and that frequently connects the epic's subject to the intended audience. Virgil, for example, included in his story of Aeneas an account of Troy's fall that occurred before the action of the poem, and a prediction in Aeneas' shield of the generations that would lead from that founder of Rome to Virgil's Emperor Augustus. Milton exaggerated this convention, including in some way in his poem all of time, from its beginning to its end.

With the addition of previous and subsequent events to the time of the poem's main action comes the complementary attribute of God: foreknowledge. Indeed, it is God's foreknowledge that allows the revelation of some of the interpolated narratives. He gives Michael the ability to predict the future, and he reveals in Heaven the approaching fall of Mankind. God's ability to see all things simultaneously is in part given to the reader of the poem through the paralleling of events. Both chronology and the theological fact of God's omniscience add to the eternal view of time that the geometrical structural parallels support.

The parallels work with the rearrangement of time, allowing us to see how all things are connected by design. Again it is design rather than causality that governs most of the parallels. Those that are causally connected could be thought to be sequentially joined. Those that are connected by a designer, God or the narrator, are geometrically arranged, and depend on space rather than time for their ordering.

Milton's poem, then, is structured on three levels of parallelism: of words and phrases, of characters and events, and of whole books. The reason for the number of such parallels is twofold. They first provide a means by which events may be judged. Paradise Lost is largely about judgement: Adam and Eve's wrong judgement, God's judgement of Adam and Eve, and the reader's judgement of God's judgement. The narrator, after all, begins by stating that the poem will "justify the ways of God to men." All actions, then, on Earth, in Heaven, or in Hell are made to seem alike so that the crucial differences between them may be noticed. The likenesses, often between morally opposite characters, reinforce a central notion of evil: that the most dangerous evil is that which most resembles good. The task then is to discern between true good and evil that seems good.[9]

The second function of the parallels is to unify the work. But unity is not an end in itself; a design so strongly ordered will suggets order in the poem's matter. As the components of the poem, from smallest to largest, are shown to be connected in a way neither accidental nor merely causal, Paradise Lost reflects what it means to assert: the justifiable ways of God. This reflection is important in Milton's epic enterprise; the poet of a literary epic must show his architectonic skill, but for the poet whose subject is religious and therefore must be believed, that skill is vital. If the reader is to believe that the poet is divinely inspired, that the Muse does visit nightly, the proof must be in the work, and that work must show order. The more complex that order is, the greater the power of the poet. A last parallel follows: the poet is to his poetic creation as God is to all of creation. Just as the poem is to show evidence of God's hand working in an intelligible way in human history, so should the poet's hand be seen in the careful ordering of the poem.

Notes

[1] I have adopted James Northrop's terms "sequential" and "geometric" from his article "The Double Structure of Paradise Lost," and will use them throughout the chapter. They are useful for distinguishing between an attention to the progressive order of things -- what events follow from other events in the poem's narrative -- and an attention to the patterns that appear at regular intervals over the whole poem.

A.S.P. Woodhouse in "Pattern in Paradise Lost" calls the two forms "Structural" and "Progressive" but I believe that Northrop's terms are less confusing; the "progressive" is also structural.

[2] Barker's reading is so "dramatic" that he also divides the poem into the five-act structure of the tragedy. He bases his divisions on Davenant's description of the movements of tragedy, and although Barker claims that the twelve-book structure changes the stress of the divisions from Satan's victory to Christ's, he pointlessly maintains the dramatic divisions even in the revised poem.

[3] He also argues for the tetractyc arrangement with which I cannot agree, and which I discuss in chapter 1. This is his numerological theory of the numbering of the books, and it is the only one that is nullified by the change from ten books to twelve.

He argues not only that the original number of lines -- 10,550 -- demonstrates the perfect Pythagorean number ten in various ways, but also that the ten books may be significantly arranged into the Pythagorean tetrachys:

I
II III
IV V VI
VII VIII IX X

The arrangement is unsatisfying for a number of reasons, and even if Milton had intended it, he did not think it so important as to maintain it in what became the poem's final version.

The other two of Shawcross' arrangements work because they match the books that were divided in 1674 (Books VII and X) with two books each (V and VI with VII; I and II with X).

[4] For a discussion of kairos and chronos, see C.A. Patrides' Milton and the Christian Tradition.

[5] Anne Ferry identifies the double perspective of the narrator in Milton's Epic Voice. He is the "interpreter to the fallen reader of the unfallen world," and he possesses both the experience of the fallen world and the inspired vision of the unfallen world and the world to come.

[6] Some of the parallels do not fit into the general structuring of the books. The appearance of the word "fruit," for example, is randomly determined, with more occurances in Book IX than in any other Book. Many of the of the other parallels do fit, however, and the pattern they show unites book to book and section to section. Books I and II are clearly meant to be recalled in Books XI and XII, for example, and Books IV and X have distinct points of comparison that connect them.

[7] While Michael, of course, is urging the fallen Adam to be virtuous so that he may regain Paradise within himself, Raphael suggests to the unfallen Adam that mankind may evolve to angelic status:

time may come when men
With Angels may participate, and find
No inconvenient Diet, nor too light Fare:
And from these corporal nutriments perhaps
Your bodies may at last turn all to spirit,
Improv'd by tract of time, and wing'd ascend
Ethereal, as wee,'or may at choice
Here or in Heav'nly Paradises dwell;
If ye be found obedient, and retain
Unalterably firm his love entire
Whose progeny you are. (V.493-503)

The possibility still exists for fallen mankind to better his lot by obedience, but the aim is an internal one, and no longer one of physical progression. Of course, Raphael's words are his own speculations, but they are logical given that the reason for mankind's creation was the repair of Heaven's ranks after the defection of the bad angels.

8 While Milton certainly wishes to stress what good God's providence can make from the evil Satan introduces, it is not clear from the poem that mankind is better off after the fall than before. Arthur Lovejoy, in "Milton and the Paradox of the Fortunate Fall," explains the problem of the felix culpa thus:

> No devout believer could hold that it would have been better if the moving drama of man's salvation had never taken place; and consequently, no such believer could consistently hold that the first act of that drama, the event from which all the rest of it sprang, was really to be regretted. Moreover, the final

> state of the redeemed, the consummation of human history, would far surpass in felicity and in moral excellence the pristine happiness and innocence of the first -- pair in Eden -- the state in which, but for the Fall, man would presumably have remained. (278)

But Milton does have his Raphael suggest that, had mankind not fallen, it could indeed have been raised above its original state; and mankind must, of course, endure much and enjoy little until that eventual greater happiness arrives. The poem offers a precarious balance, then, between unfallen joys and redeemed ones, a balance in which Provi dence can be seen to be doing its job without belittling Adam's and Eve's transgressions.

[9] Such distinction is, of course at the core of many of Milton's poems, including Comus where the Lady has to distinguish between truth and "false rules prankt in reason's garb" (759).

Works Cited

Addison, Joseph. "Critique of *Paradise Lost*." *Spectator* 31 December 1711, 5 January 1712. In *Milton: The Critical Heritage*. Ed. John T. Shawcross. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1970.

Adler, Cyrus et al ed. *The Jewish Encyclopedia*. New York: K.T.A.V. Publishing, 1901.

Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Poetry*. New York: Basic Books, 1985.

Ariosto, Ludovico. *Orlando Furioso*. Trans. William Stewart Rose. Ed. Stewart A. Baker and A. Bartlett Giamatti. Introduction by A. Bartlett Giamatti. Indianapolis and New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1968.

Auerbach, Erich. *Scenes From the Drama of Western Literature. Theory and History of Literature*, v 9. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

----. *Dante: Poet of the Secular World*. Trans. Ralph Mannheim. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Augustine. *Confessiones*. Trans. Sir Tobie Matthew. Revised and amended Dom Roger Hudleston. London: Burns and Oates, 1923.

Barker, Arthur. "Structural Pattern in *Paradise Lost*." *PQ* 28 (1949): 17-30.

Berek, Peter. "'Plain' and 'Ornate' Styles and the Structure of *Paradise Lost*." *PMLA* 85 (1970): 237-46.

Berkovitch, Sacvan ed. *Typology and Early American Literature*. Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts Press, 1972.

Berlin, Adele. *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985.

Berry, Boyd M. *Process of Speech: Puritan Religious Writing and* Paradise Lost. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976.

The Bible. King James Version.

Bloom, Harold. The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.

Bowra, C.M. Homer. New York: Scribner's, 1972.

de Bruyne, Edgar. Etudes D'Esthetique Medievale. Geneve, Slatkin Reprints,1946.

Burden, Dennis H. The Logical Epic: A Study of the Argument of Paradise Lost. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1967.

Calvin, John. Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul to the Galatians and Ephesians, trans Rev. William Pringle (Edinburgh, 1841).

Carey, John Ed. The Minor Poems and Samson Agonistes. In The Poems of John Milton. London: Longmans, Green and co, 1968.

Charity, A.C. Events and their Afterlife: The Dialectics of Christian Typology in the Bible and Dante. Cambridge: University Press, 1966.

Colie, Rosalie L. "Time and Eternity: Paradox and Structure in Paradise Lost." Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institute 23 (1960): 127-38.

Cope, Jackson I. The Metaphoric Structure of Paradise Lost. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1962.

Crump, Galbraith Miller. The Mystical Design of Paradise Lost. Lewisburg, P.A.: Bucknell University Press, 1975.

Danielou, Jean S.J. From Shadows to Reality: Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers. Translated by Wulstan Hibberd. London: Burns and Oats, 1960.

Davenant, William. "Preface to Gondibert." In Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century. Ed. J.B. Spingarn. v. II, 17-18. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1908-9.

Davis, Thomas M. "The Traditions of Puritan Typology" In *Typology and Early American Literature*. Ed. Sacvan Bercovitch. Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts Press, 1972. 11-46.

Donne, John. *The Complete English Poems*. Ed. A.J. Smith. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin, 1983.

Duckworth, George Eckel. *Structural Patterns and Proportions in Vergil's* Aeneid. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1962.

DuRocher, Richard. *Milton and Ovid*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1985.

Eliot, T.S. "Milton I" and "Milton II." *On Poetry and Poets*. New York: The Noonday Press, 1957.

Empson, William. *Milton's God*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1961.

----. *Seven Types of Ambiguity*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1930.

Ferry, Anne Davidson. *Milton's Epic Voice: The Narrator in* Paradise Lost. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963.

Fielding, Henry. *Tom Jones*. Norton Critical Edition. New York: W.W. Norton, 1973.

----. *Amelia*. *The Complete Works of Henry Fielding*, vol. VI and VII.New York: Barnes and Noble, 1967.

Fowler, Alastair. Preface and Notes. John Milton. *Paradise Lost*. New York: Longman, 1968.

----. *Triumphal Forms: Structural Patterns in Elizabethan Poetry*. Cambridge: University Press, 1970.

Froehlich, Karlfried. "'Always to Keep the Literal Sense in Holy Scripture Means to Kill One's Soul': The State of Biblical Hermeneutics at the Beginning of the Fifteenth Century." In *Literary Uses of Typology From the Late Middle Ages to the Present*. Ed. Earl Miner. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977. 20-48.

Frye, Northrop. "The Structure of Imagery in The Faerie Queene." U.T.Q. 30 (1960-61): 109-127.

----. The Return of Eden: Five Essays on Milton's Epics. Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1965.

Giamatti, A. Bartlett. The Earthly Paradise and the Renaissance Epic. Princeton, N.J.: University Press, 1966.

Goldknopf, David. "The Failure of Plot in 'Tom Jones'." Criticism 11 (1969): 262-74.

Goppelt, Leonhard. Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New. Trans. Donald H. Madvig, foreword by E. Earle Ellis, Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1982.

Greene, Thomas. The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982.

Halkett, John. Milton and the Idea of Matrimony: A Study of the Divorce Tracts and Paradise Lost. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1970

Hamilton, A.C. The Structure of Allegory in The Faerie Queene. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.

----. 'Like race to runne': The Parallel Structure of The Faerie Queene, Books I and II." PMLA 73 (1958): 327- 334.

Hanford, James Holly. "Samson Agonistes and Milton in Old Age." Studies in Shakespeare, Milton and Donne. New York: MacMillan, 1925.

Helterman, Jeffrey. Symbolic Action in the Plays of the Wakefield Master. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1981.

Hieatt, A. Kent. Short Time's Endless Monument: The Symbolism of the Numbers in Edmund Spenser's "Epithalamion." New York: Columbia University Press, 1960

Homer. The Iliad. Trans. and with an introduction by Richmond Latimore. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951.

----. The Odyssey. Trans. and with an introduction by Richmond Lattimore. New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1965.

Jakobsen, Roman. "Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry." Lingua 21 (1968): 597-609.

Jesperson, Otto. Language: Its Nature, Development, and Origin. London: G. Allen and Unwin, 1922.

Johnson, Samuel. "Preface to Milton's Poems" in The Oxford Authors, ed. Donald Greene. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.

Kates, Judith A. Tasso and Milton: The Problem of Christian Epic. London: Associated University Presses, 1983.

Krouse, F. Michael. Milton's Samson and the Christian Tradition. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949.

Landor, Walter Savage. Imaginary Conversations of Literary Men and Statesmen. Second Edition. London: H Colburn, 1826-8.

Leavis, F.R. Revaluation:Tradition and Development in English Poetry. London: Chatto and Windus, 1936.

Le Comte, Edward S. A Dictionary of Puns in Milton's English Poetry. New York: Columbia University Press, 1981.

Lewalski, B.K. Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979.

----. "Typological Symbolism and the 'Progress of the Soul' in Seventeenth-Century Literature." In Literary Uses of Typology, ed. Earl Miner. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977. 79-114.

----. "Samson Agonistes and the 'Tragedy' of the Apocalypse." PMLA 85 (1970): 1050-62.

----. "Structure and the Symbolism of Vision in Michael's Prophecy, Paradise Lost, Books XI-XII." PQ XLII (1963): 25-35.

Lewis, C.S. A Preface to Paradise Lost. London: Oxford University Press, 1942.

Lovejoy, Arthur O. Essays in The History of Ideas. Baltimore, 1948.

Low, Anthony. "Milton's God: Authority in Paradise Lost." Milton Studies 4 (1972): 26.

Lowth, Robert. "Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews." 1853.

MacCaffrey, Isabel Gamble. Paradise Lost as "Myth". Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1959.

MacCallum, H.R. "Milton and Figurative Interpretation of the Bible." UTQ 31 (1962): 397-415.

----. "Milton and Sacred History: Books XI and XII of Paradise Lost" In Essays in English Literature from the Renaissance to the Victorian Age Presented to A.S.P. Woodhouse. Ed Millar Maclure and F.W. Watt. Toronto: U of T Press, 1964. 149-68.

----. Milton and the Sons of God: The Divine Image in Milton's Epic Poetry. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986.

Madsen, William G. From Shadowy Types to Truth: Studies in Milton's Symbolism. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1968.

Manning, Stephen. "Scriptural Exegesis and the Literary Critic." In Typology and Early American Literature. Sacvan Bercovitch ed. Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts Press, 1972. 47-68.

Miles, Josephine. Major Adjectives in English Poetry From Wyatt to Auden. University of California Publications in English, XII, No. 3. Berkeley, 1946.

Milton, John. Complete Poems and Major Prose. Ed. Merrett Y. Hughes. Indianapolis: The Odyssey Press, 1957.

Moskalew, Walter. Verbal Repetition in Vergil's Aeneid. Ph.D Dissertation, Yale University, 1975.

Moyles, Gordon. The Text of Paradise Lost. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985

Newton, Thomas. "Notes to Paradise Lost." Milton 1732-1801: The Critical Heritage. Ed. John T. Shawcross. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972.

Northrop, Douglas A. "The Double Structure of Paradise Lost." Milton Studies 12 (1978): 75-90.

Owen, W.J.B. "The Structure of The Faerie Queene." PMLA 68 (1953): 1079-1100.

Parker, William Riley. "The Date of Samson Agonistes."PQ 28 (1949): 145-66.

Parry, Milman. "Studies in the Epic Technique of Oral Verse-making, I: Homer and Homeric Style." In The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

Pecheux, Mother Mary Christopher. "The Concept of the Second Eve in Paradise Lost." PMLA 75 (1960): 359-66.

Pound, Ezra. Literary Essays. Ed. T.S. Eliot. New York: New Directions, 1954.

Prince, F.T. "On The Last Two Books Of Paradise Lost." Essays and Studies XI (1958), 38-52.

Qvarnström, Gunnar. The Enchanted Palace: Some Structural Aspects of Paradise Lost. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1967.

Raleigh, Sir Walter A. Milton. London: E. Arnold, 1920.

Ricks, Christopher. Milton's Grand Style. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.

Rivers, Isabel. Classical and Christian Ideas in English Renaissance Poetry: a Student's Guide. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1979.

Roche, Thomas P. The Kindly Flame: A Study of the Third and Fourth Books of Spenser's Faerie Queene. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1964.

Rosenblatt, Jason P. "Structural Unity and Temporal Concordance: The War in Heaven in Paradise Lost." PMLA 87 (1972): 31-41.

Røstvig, Maren-Sophie. "The Hidden Sense". In The Hidden Sense and Other Essays. Norwegian Studies in English, ix. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1963.

Scott-Craig, T.S.K. "Concerning Milton's Samson." Renaissance News 3 (1952): 45-53.

Shawcross, John T. "The Balanced Structure of Paradise Lost." Studies in Philology 62 (1965): 696-718.

Shepherd, Simon Ed. The Women's Sharp Revenge: Five Women's Pamphlets from the Renaissance. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1985.

Sirluck, Ernest. "Milton's Idle Right Hand." JEGP 60 (1961): 749-85.

Spenser, Edmund. The Faerie Queene. Ed. A.C. Hamilton. New York and London: Longman, 1977.

Steadman, John. "Tantalus and the Dead Sea Apples (Paradise Lost, X, 547-73)." Studies in Philology 59 (1962): 35- 40.

----."Heroic Virtue and the Divine Image in Paradise Lost."JWI 22 (1959):

Stevens, Paul. Imagination and the Presence of Shakespeare in Paradise Lost. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985.

Stoll, E.E. "Time and Space in Milton" In From Shakespeare to Joyce. New York: Doubleday, 1944.

Summers, Joseph. The Muse's Method: An Introduction to Paradise Lost. London: Chatto and Windus, 1962.

Svendsen, Kester. Milton and Science. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956.

Swaim, Kathleen. "'Hee for God only, shee for God in him': Structural Parallelism in Paradise Lost." Milton Studies 9 (1976): 121-49.

----. "Flower, Fruit, and Seed: a Reading of Paradise Lost. Milton Studies 5 (1973): 155-76.

Tasso, Torquato. Godfrey of Bulloigne: A Critical Edition of Edward Fairfax's translation of Tasso's Gerusalemme Liberata together with Fairfax's original poems. Ed. Kathleen M. Lea and T.M. Gang. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 198.

Waldock, A.J.A. Paradise Lost and its Critics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1947.

Walter, J.H. "'The Faerie Queene': Alterations and Structure." MLR 36 (1941): 37-58.

Watson, J.R. "Divine Providence and the Structure of Paradise Lost." Essays in Criticism, 14 (1964), 148-155.

Watters, William R. Formula Criticism and the Poetry of the Old Testament. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1976.

Wells, Robin Headlam. Spenser's Faerie Queene and the Cult of Elizabeth. London and Canberra: Croom Helm, 1983.

Whaler, James. Counterpoint and Symbol: An Inquiry into the Rhythm of Milton's Epic Style. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1956.

Wittkower, Rudolf. Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism. London: A. Tirante, 1962.

Wittreich, Joseph Anthony Jr. Angel of Apocalypse: Blake's Idea of Milton. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1975.

Woodhouse, A.S.P. "Nature and Grace in The Faerie Queene." ELH 16 (1949): 194-228.

----. "Samson Agonistes and Milton's Experience." Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, 3rd Ser., 43, sec. 2 (1949): 157-58.

Virgil. The Aeneid. Trans. Robert Fitzgerald. New York: Vintage Books, 1980.